Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-084
Wednesday
1 May 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-084 *1 May 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: On 6 May 1991, the DAILY REPORT will begin phasing in new radio and television sourcelines that reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" and "Television Service" designations in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Yakovlev Ponders USSR's 'Great Power' Status *[IZVESTIYA 27 Apr]* 1
Future of European Security, NATO Pondered *[IZVESTIYA 30 Apr]* 2
Union Given Observer Status in GATT Committee *[TASS]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Dual Policy' Viewed as 'Ill-Timed' *[TASS]* 4
Bush Comments Cited *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 4

China

PRAVDA Describes Sino-Soviet Border Talks *[30 Apr]* 4
Issue's Importance Stressed *[Moscow International]* 5
Defense Minister Yazov To Visit PRC in May *[TASS]* 5

Northeast Asia

DPRK Paper Critical of Gorbachev-No Summit *[PRAVDA 1 May]* 6
ROK's Yi Sang-ok's Japan, U.S. Trips Viewed *[Moscow International]* 6
ROK Agrees To Exchange of Military Attaches *[Moscow Radio]* 7
PRAVDA Runs Gorbachev Tokyo News Conference *[20 Apr]* 7

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospects for Cambodian Peace Settlement Examined *[IZVESTIYA 30 Apr]* 12
Meeting of Thai, Cambodian Premiers Viewed *[Moscow International]* 13

Near East & South Asia

Bessmertnykh on Chance for Mideast Peace *[Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 29 Apr]* 13
IZVESTIYA on Results of Kislovodsk Talks *[27 Apr]* 14
Latest Round of Baker Mideast Diplomacy Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]* 15
U.S. 'Buildup' in Northern Iraq, Turkey Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Apr]* 15
Kurd Solidarity Group Meets Iraqi Kurd Front *[TASS]* 16
Russian Deputy Says Tanks Exported to Iran *[Berlin ADN]* 17

East Europe

Albanian Foreign Minister Interviewed *[NOVOYE VREMYA No. 14]* 17
Romania's Iliescu Defends New Treaty With USSR *[IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]* 17
CSFR's Havel Cited on New Treaty With USSR *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 18
Hamburg Daily Reports Honecker Back in Moscow *[Berlin ADN]* 18

West Europe

Pavlov Returns to Moscow After Brussels Visit *[TASS]* 18
Pavlov Interviewed on Visit *[PRAVDA 1 May]* 19
Gorbachev, Kohl Discuss Treaties on Telephone *[TASS]* 20
FRG Low-Key Reception of Georgians Viewed *[PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 20

Latin America & Caribbean

Castro Blames Economic Ills on External Events *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Apr]* 20

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

More on Pavlov 23 Apr Responses to Deputies *[IZVESTIYA 25 Apr]* 22
Girenko Chairs Nationalities Panel Sitting *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Apr]* 23
Soviet of Nationalities S. Ossetia Resolution *[IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]* 23
Polls Show Less Confidence in Supreme Soviet *[IZVESTIYA 20 Apr]* 24

Political & Social

Moscow TV Carries May Day Celebration 24
Shmakov Makes Opening Remarks 26
Shcherbakov Addresses Rally 26
Shmakov Reads Trade Union Resolution 27
Gorbachev, Yeltsin Exchange May Day Greetings *[Moscow Radio]* 28
'No Support' for Stalinist Demonstration *[TASS]* 28
Radio Rossii Reports Popov Presence *[Radio Rossii]* 29
Gorbachev Greets Peace Body on Anniversary *[PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 29
13 Republic Representatives Confer in Tallinn *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 29
Sobchak Hails Meeting Results *[TASS]* 29
Pavlov, Prokofyev Cited on State of USSR *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 May]* 30
'Statement of Ten' Analyzed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 31
CPSU Should Compromise With Other Parties *[PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 33
TASS Reviews Press for 1 May 35

Economic

77 Kuzbass Mines Remain on Strike *[AFP]* 35
Strike Situation Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 36
Belorussian Miners Return to Work *[Minsk Radio]* 36
Anticrisis Program Termed 'Political Maneuver' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Apr]* 36
Economic Consequences of Union Split Viewed *[TRUD 23 Apr]* 38
Trade Union Official on Tension in Oil Industry *[Moscow Radio]* 40

Agricultural

Cabinet Orders Aim To Promote Spring Field Work *[PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 40
Shortages, Idleness Threaten Grain Supplies *[PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 40
Politburo's Stroyev Comments on Spring Campaign *[GLASNOST No. 16]* 42

Military

Arbatov Urges New European Security System *[Vienna DER STANDARD 30 Apr]* 43
Deputy Defense Minister Promoted to Army General *[Moscow TV]* 44
'Shchit' Chairman Visits Germany *[TASS]* 44
Defense Official Criticizes Press Articles *[TASS]* 44

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Savisaar Attacked by Both Right, Left *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 2 Apr]* 46
Baltic Communists Hold Congress in Riga *[PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 47
Meeting 'Important' Beyond Baltics *[TASS]* 48
Riga Meeting on Withdrawal of Forces Held *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Apr]* 48
Latvian Supreme Soviet Deputy Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 26 Apr]* 48
Latvia Protests Baltic Soldiers' Union Moves *[Riga Radio]* 51
Latvian Dispute With Moscow Over Budget Noted *[Riga Radio]* 51
Landsbergis Forced To Delay FRG Visit *[Vilnius International]* 51
Landsbergis Wants Talks on Norway Pact *[Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET 25 Apr]* 51
Army Claim to Lithuanian DOSAAF Property Contested
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Apr] 52
Lithuanian Moves Toward Own Army Deplored *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Apr]* 53

RSFSR

Yeltsin Participates in Novokuznetsk May Day Rally *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Reportage on Yeltsin's Visit With Miners 54
Informs Miners on Power Transfer *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Updates Workers on Meeting Results *[Radio Rossii]* 54
Notes Joint Statement *[Radio Rossii]* 55
Siberian Mine Visits Reported *[Moscow TV]* 55
Yeltsin-Kryuchkov Agreement on KGB Expected *[IZVESTIYA 30 Apr]* 55
Further on Moscow Pro-Yeltsin Rally *[Moscow TV]* 55
Prokofyev Hits Yeltsin's 'Fuehrer's' Ambitions *[PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 56
Russian Federation Marks May Day With Marches *[TASS]* 56
Text of Law on RSFSR President Published *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Apr]* 57
Six Candidates Nominated *[TASS]* 58
Ryzhkov Prepared To Run *[TASS]* 59
Polozkov Welcomes Trend of Recent Events *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Apr]* 59
Democratic Party 'Differences' Viewed *[TASS]* 59
Law on Rehabilitating Repressed Nations Adopted *[IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]* 60

Western Republics

Malofeyev on Belorussian Strike Report *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 24 Apr]* 60
Youth Paper Interviews Ukraine's Kravchuk *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Apr]* 62
Kravchuk Favorably Assesses Bavaria Visit *[Kiev International]* 65
Rukh Leader Discusses Union Treaty, Commonwealth *[Kiev International]* 65
UN Official Examines Chernobyl Problems *[IZVESTIYA 27 Apr]* 66
24 Apr Ukrainian Legislature Session Detailed *[Kiev International]* 66

Caucasus

Further Reportage on Georgian Earthquake Damage 67
Emergencies Commission Issues Report *[TASS]* 67
Gorbachev Sends Condolences *[TASS]* 68
Georgia Rejects Moscow's Aid *[AFP]* 68
South Ossetia Situation 'Very Tense' *[TASS]* 68
Situation 'Extremely Exacerbated' *[TASS]* 68
TV Describes Tskhinvali Tensions *[Moscow TV]* 69
Interior Ministry Protests USSR Troop Actions 69
'Tyrannical Actions' Cited *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 12 Apr]* 69
Minister's Letter to USSR Counterpart *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 12 Apr]* 70
Georgian Supreme Soviet Appeals for Unity *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 12 Apr]* 70
Armenia Creates State of Emergency Council *[Yerevan Radio]* 71
Armenian-Azerbaijani Shootouts Continue *[TASS]* 72
New Clashes Between Armenians, Azerbaijanis *[TASS]* 72

Missiles Batter Azerbaijani Town Shusha *[Moscow TV]* 72
Mutalibov Threatens Sanctions Over NKAO *[Moscow TV]* 73
Nagorno-Karabakh Situation 'Extremely Tense' *[TASS]* 73
Azerbaijan Approves Results of Moscow Meeting *[TASS]* 74

Central Asia

Dzasokhov Presses Need for 'Political Stability' *[PRAVDA 19 Apr]* 74
Uzbek Leader Hails Republics' Joint Statement *[TASS]* 75
Nishanov Meets With Voters in Fergana *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 75
Turkmen President Appoints New Party Secretary *[Ashkabad Radio]* 75
Turkmenistan's Muradov on Joint Statement *[Moscow TV]* 75
'Market Riots' Reported in Southern Tajikistan *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Apr]* 76
Kyrgyz President Comments on Joint Statement *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Apr]* 76

Yakovlev Ponders USSR's 'Great Power' Status

PM2904114791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

["IZVESTIYA Interview" with USSR Presidential Adviser A. Yakovlev by IZVESTIYA correspondent S. Agafonov in Tokyo; date not given; first paragraph is introduction: "A. Yakovlev: We Must Get Accustomed to Civilized Relations"]

[Text] Tokyo—USSR senior presidential adviser A. Yakovlev was a member of the Soviet delegation during the recent summit talks in Tokyo: He did not fly back to Moscow with the entire "team" but stayed in Japan until this Saturday [27 April], having been invited to several important functions organized by the mass media here. Aleksandr Nikolayevich's program was full to bursting, but he still found time to meet IZVESTIYA's correspondent.

[Yakovlev] I will not talk about the summit meeting itself—so much has already been said and written about it. However, I would like to say something about certain aspects of the Japanese perception of our dialogue and the overall foreign policy background today. I will start by saying that by and large I thought that the Japanese were satisfied with the visit and its results. Japanese approaches to relations with our country were observed to have been liberated—which I even thought somewhat unexpected. After all, outright reluctance to speak of economic matters ruled the roost previously, and everything was reduced to a rigid linkage with political questions. Now they willingly discuss these matters—in a practical context, too.

I had a lot of meetings with representatives of business circles and businessmen. Many of them now acknowledge that Japanese approaches toward the USSR in previous years were artificially restricted and overpoliticized. This political "weight" around our ankles disappeared, as it were, after the summit dialogue. A very great deal now depends on our side—how far we are able to make use of the emergent opportunity to develop economic relations. Not only economic relations, of course, but also scientific, technical, and cultural ties. For example, our proposal to build a Japanese-Soviet university in Khabarovsk met with a good reception here. Professors and public figures here have voiced a high opinion of the decision to set up a research center into modern Japan in Moscow. The Academy of Sciences has appointed me head of this center, and in this capacity I suggested that the Japanese set up a similar institute in Japan to study Soviet problems. This idea was taken seriously and met with great interest. In short, scope is opening up for vigorous and extremely extensive activity in various spheres.

But this does not mean that everything will go smoothly. I also had arguments here. Many Western, including Japanese, articles quite deliberately emphasize the idea that the Soviet Union wants to step up relations with Japan since its prospects as a great power are declining. This discussion was also, incidentally, struck up at the International Press Institute's General Assembly in whose work I took part and was thus debated in earnest. In my view, this premise is totally wrong. In what way is it on the decline? It turns out like this: It was a great power under Stalin when we intimidated the whole world by setting up our regime; it was also a great power under Khrushchev, particularly during the second half of his rule, when the new wave of conservatism started up after the thaw and arms began to be stockpiled; we were also great under Brezhnev when we waged this foolish, insane arms race with the Americans and stockpiled thousands of warheads and missiles. Did we thus cease to be a great power when we began to disarm, when we called for a world without wars and weapons, and pledged not to set foot on other people's territories? So, what must be included in the term "great power" for contemporary understanding—force? That is a throwback to the old thinking. A power's greatness should be assessed by different criteria now—by the criteria of morality, peaceableness, desire to cooperate, and so on.

It is curious that the West's raising of this problem directly echoes many arguments advanced by our ultraconservative circles. Many left-wingers in our country have also been caught out here, speaking of the decline in the country's prestige. These arguments harbor a great danger. If our world partners consider themselves great or small powers depending on how many warheads they have, our hopes that an era of peace and cooperation will set in are in vain. But within the country such opinions are based on the former imperial thinking. The word "betrayal" was uttered from our parliament's rostrum when there was talk of East Europe, but that is based on purely imperial thinking.

The following element is often present: People say that, while demonstrating the new thinking, the USSR is, as it were, "excluding itself" from the global context, losing its clout, and so on and so forth. The subject of Iraq is used to confirm this. All these syntheses are however based on the fact that there were no troops of ours in the conflict zone. And the regular contacts between the Soviet leadership and the leaders of the world's leading powers do not seem to come into the calculation. The Soviet Union's role in itself in all this seems absolutely exceptional. Imagine, had this happened five or six years ago, the answer would have been unequivocal, there would have been confrontation between the two great powers and interminable disputes. But the USSR has kept the promise it made at the very outset to oppose the aggressor and violence. The Soviet Union is consistent in its policy and it is for this reason that there is now consensus in world politics, which is far more important. It is a different matter that some U.S. chauvinists are beginning to incorrectly interpret the outcome of the conflict itself, ascribing victory to America and its role alone, stressing that there is just one great power left now. You still run up against this, but it does not determine the crux of the policy since both the U.S. and Soviet leaderships were in very close contact during these events.

Although the problem is of course broader. I must speak about domestic affairs once more. The democratization process in the country has conflicted with our sluggish consciousness and with the interests of numerous groups interested in perestroyka who led a far cozier life under the old system, under the administrative edict system. We know the results this had—the country is in a most grave state. Our loudmouths clamoring for greatness and ideals cannot answer a single simple question: Why did a country unparalleled in terms of natural resources and potential suddenly become a country of "average development," if not worse? Why is it poverty-stricken? Why can we not feed ourselves and do the simplest things, why are we still spoiling nature? If they can answer these questions, I will stop arguing with them. However, we will hardly get a sensible answer and we must thus grow accustomed to civilized relations and continue what we have started. Including the foreign policy that has taken shape over the last six years. Changes there may be fatal.

Future of European Security, NATO Pondered

PM3004141191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Apr 91 Union Edition p 7

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion" article: "Not Such a Fantastic Scenario"]

[Text] Contingents of our forces have begun leaving the last one of the countries where they were stationed after the end of World War II—namely Poland, which directly follows their withdrawal from the CSFR, Hungary, and the former GDR. The Warsaw Pact's military structure has been abolished. The disappearance of its political superstructure is on the horizon. CEMA's activities are winding down.

The dramatic changes in this region of Europe are coming to a final and irreversible conclusion. In these conditions, NATO henceforth emerges as the sole military grouping on the continent. Nothing similar or parallel opposes this organization any longer.

An approximately similar state of affairs prevailed in the first half of the 1950's. The Warsaw Pact emerged in 1955, six years after the creation of NATO. But at that time bilateral mutual assistance treaties operated between the USSR and East European countries. That is, a security system operated in this part of Europe.

Now even that will go. The aforementioned treaties will soon be replaced by less binding agreements which are not based on the principles of fraternal solidarity between participants. At most their motto will be good neighborliness, and the countries involved will have to do some thorough work to attain even that aim.

In any case, there will be no need to nudge Moscow into practical conclusions from the new realities prevailing in Eastern Europe. We did not hesitate to meet the new East European leaders halfway when they began talking of how unacceptable they found the preservation of the bloc structure in this part of the continent.

We knew what we were going into. Although repeated appeals were made in our press and from official platforms for NATO chiefs to follow the example of the countries belonging to the Warsaw Pact's military organization and dissolve the corresponding structure in the Brussels headquarters, we could hardly nurture any great illusions on the imminent realization of such a step.

Influential voices in favor of simultaneously dismantling NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization could also be heard in East European countries until recently. CSFR diplomats submitted noteworthy initiatives in the first half of last year. Prague suggested moving toward the building of a common European security system on the basis of the abolition of NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization.

NATO leaders did not support this idea, and Prague abandoned it as well. Official circles in the CSFR are now promoting another idea: Gradual steps toward closer ties with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Something is being undertaken on a practical level too. Representatives from Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania are establishing contacts with NATO and participating in the work of the North Atlantic Assembly. Talks are being held on the training of East European officers in NATO countries.

Our official reaction to this process is, for understandable reasons, negative. The expansion of NATO's sphere of activity in some form or other to the USSR borders can in no way be considered desirable from the point of view of our security interests. The result would be a sharp destabilization of the entire situation on the continent. Of course, in that case we would still have a mighty defensive potential of both nuclear missiles and conventional weapons but, given the leading NATO states' identical potential, the situation in general would be highly delicate to put it mildly.

In outlining such an unattractive scenario, the author of these notes has in mind a version whereby the "linkage" of other countries to NATO would occur without the Soviet Union's participation in this process, in other words our country would be isolated from it.

But do things have to be done like that without fail? Certainly not. First, not only the opposition political forces in the West but also the ruling parties through their leaders are unambiguously opposed to any steps which would mean isolating our country, in other words returning to the times when East European countries served as a "sanitary corridor" between the USSR and the West.

Second, a certain cooperation is emerging between our country and NATO: Contacts are being established between representatives of the armed forces, military doctrines are being discussed, and other steps in the same direction are being taken.

This process has its own logic. It could lead development to the point where the question on the USSR's participation in NATO will arise in practical terms. Fantasy? No. This question was already raised by the Soviet leadership thirty seven years ago. The Soviet Government sent notes to the governments of France, Britain, and the United States on 31 March 1954, advocating that the question of the USSR's participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization be discussed with the aim of eliminating its exclusive nature and creating a collective security system on the continent. It is worth noting that this proposal was combined with ideas intended to overcome the division of Germany, which the Soviet side had raised at the Berlin conference of the four powers at the beginning of 1954.

At that time, however, these initiatives by Moscow had no chance of success. The "cold war" was raging with no signs of abating. West and East Europe armed themselves desperately against each other. Possible deadlines for a massive conflict were openly discussed. No wonder Moscow's surprising initiative on USSR membership of NATO was rejected by NATO governments out of hand.

Now the situation is radically altered. NATO has no opponents. This has been officially recognized by that organization's leaders. Speaking in Copenhagen at the beginning of April, NATO Secretary General M. Woerner advocated the creation of new security structures which, once the Warsaw Pact had been disbanded, would embrace the USSR and East European countries as well as neutral states. In his words, these structures could include defense aspects and could operate in the context of an all-European process or under the auspices of the European Community or even the West European Union.

But what about NATO? Should this organization remain exclusive by nature? M. Woerner sticks to old attitudes on this score. But everything he said in this speech brings the matter straight to the idea of transforming NATO into an all-European organization.

Furthermore, the verification and confidence-building measures already operating on a Europe-wide scale and those which are still being negotiated in Vienna, render the norms and rules of secrecy on which the Warsaw Pact and NATO activities were built increasingly obsolete from a technical viewpoint. And in that respect, the current situation in Europe is strikingly different to the one which existed three or four decades ago.

There can be only one explanation for NATO's continued existence as an exclusive organization—plans and strategies directed against non-participating states. NATO leaders categorically deny any such intentions. M. Woerner recently made yet another significant announcement: He said that, in the new conditions, NATO intends to pursue a policy of partnership and friendship in relations with East European countries.

However, Europe does not end along the borders of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria. The broader the framework of such a partnership, the better the chances of peace on the continent. Is that not so?

Union Given Observer Status in GATT Committee

LD3004135891 Moscow TASS in English 1234 GMT 30 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Makarchev]

[Text] Geneva April 30 TASS—The Soviet Union was granted today the status of observer in the antidumping GATT committee, after applying for the status last month.

The non-voting membership gives the Soviet Union a possibility to observe how international trade rules and norms are worked out.

GATT Council admitted the USSR as an observer last May thus becoming the first major international trade and economic body to start cooperating with the Soviet Union.

The status of observer in the antidumping committee will help the USSR to look for optimal ways of integrating its economy into the world market.

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Dual Policy' Viewed as 'Ill-Timed'

LD3004173291 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 30 Apr 91

[By TASS international news analyst Gennadiy Petrov]

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS—According to a report in the latest issue of NEWSWEEK magazine, the George Bush administration has decided to adhere henceforth to a dual policy with regard to the Soviet Union.

This new approach, according to the magazine, includes a number of "direct contacts with individual republics" along with invariable support for Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. NEWSWEEK magazine explains which republics exactly are meant. Bush people are intensifying contacts with the leaders of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, NEWSWEEK reported.

Other U.S. publications state similar opinions. The WASHINGTON POST, in particular, points out that administration spokesmen follow with increasing attention the endeavours of the central authority and republics and want any aid to be distributed between opponents in a balanced way.

Of course, a "dual policy" is a convenient attitude for those who, in the face of the complex situation, would like to monitor the development of events on a wait-and-see basis.

But to what extent such an attitude accords with the lasting interests of Soviet-U.S. relations, the efforts to build a new world order, which is spoken of in Washington, and, finally, the real state of affairs in the USSR?

Following the recent signing of the "Statement of the Ten" by President Gorbachev and the leaders of nine major republics of the country—the document which is expected to serve as a basis to overcome the current discord and create conditions to stabilise the situation in the Soviet Union—"duality" in the U.S. Administration's policy seems to be ill-timed, to put it mildly.

The development of U.S. relations directly with individual republics, in disregard of the role of the centre, would hardly promote a constructive dialogue between representatives of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, on the one hand, and Moscow on the other. This means that such a change of emphases in Washington's policy with regard to the Soviet Union would not serve the cause of stabilising the situation in the Soviet Union, the situation which arouses concern among Western leaders, including George Bush.

The U.S. decision to pursue a "dual policy" with regard to the Soviet Union was probably taken in the White House prior to the emergence of new and such important factors as the "Statement of the Ten" and the plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee—which, contrary to prophecies by some analysts, confirmed the role of Mikhail Gorbachev as the political leader rather than diminish it?

In this case, one would like to hope that the Bush administration will take these circumstances into consideration and will not do harm—wittingly or unwittingly—to the nascent process of stabilising the political and economic situation in the USSR.

Bush Comments Cited

PM3004185791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, POSTFAKTUM, REUTER roundup: "Bush on Relations With USSR"]

[Text] U.S. President Bush, addressing editors of the country's farming newspapers, stated among other things: "The U.S. Administration wants to maintain good relations with the Soviet Union. It already has good relations with the USSR, but the strengthening of economic ties, in particular the granting of additional credits, including agricultural credits, to the Soviet Union, is complicated by the tremendous internal economic problems in the USSR and the instability of the economic situation." In his words, "on the question of credits we are bound by our laws and they protect the U.S. taxpayers. There must be definite creditworthiness."

Answering questions on his administration's attitude toward the USSR leadership and the possible consequences of changes in it, the U.S. President said: "I have chosen a course of maintaining close contact with Mr. Gorbachev. He is the one in place there now. From time to time we meet at various levels—myself included—with opposition leaders, with Baltic leaders. There are differences between us and the USSR leadership, for example, as regards contact with the republics. But what happened last week was in a certain sense very encouraging because there were rumors that Gorbachev has problems even with the party, and I think that what happened showed that this is not so. In my opinion, the departure of President Gorbachev would mean uncertainty within the Soviet Union. I would like to believe that the changes in the USSR—the greater openness and glasnost—are irreversible."

China

PRAVDA Describes Sino-Soviet Border Talks

PM3004125391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Fifth Round"]

[Text] By agreement, the fifth round of Sino-Soviet talks on border questions took place in Moscow 25 through 29 April. The Soviet and Chinese government delegations

were headed by I.A. Rogachev and Tian Zengpei, respectively deputy foreign ministers of the USSR and the PRC.

Representatives of Union republics bordering on China—the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, and the Tajik SSR—took part in the talks as part of the Soviet delegation.

During the talks, which took place in a friendly and businesslike atmosphere, the Soviet and Chinese sides summed up the results of their work and noted the progress made since the previous round of border talks. The heads of the USSR and PRC government delegations initialed a USSR-PRC agreement on the eastern section of the Sino-Soviet state border and also ratified accords reached by three working groups dealing with the consideration of sections yet to be agreed upon, the legal registration of the agreed border line, and topographical matters.

The sides agreed to continue their consideration of sections yet to be agreed on on the basis of the appropriate principles and in the spirit of the Sino-Soviet joint communique of 1989.

The next round of Sino-Soviet border talks will be held in Beijing.

Issue's Importance Stressed

OW0105072691 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Commentary by station commentator Kondratyev; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] In preparation for the upcoming visit to the Soviet Union in mid-May this year by the Chinese party and state leader, Jiang Zemin, efforts actively are being made to strengthen the bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and China. An example in point is the fifth round of border negotiations between the two countries, which was just concluded in Moscow. Tian Zengpei, head of the Chinese delegation for the talks, was received by Aleksandr A. Bessmertnykh, Soviet minister of foreign affairs. This showed that the Soviet side took this round of negotiations very seriously. How does our station commentator Kondratyev view this event? The following is his commentary.

The commentator pointed out: Both Moscow and Beijing have attached great importance to building confidence along their borders, which was well reflected in the joint communique following Gorbachev's visit to China in 1989. A year later, the communique found further support in an accord under which both sides agreed mutually to reduce their armed forces along their borders and to build up confidence in each other's military establishments.

By mentioning these two official documents, I am trying to stress the importance of the border issue in bilateral relations, because not long ago, tension still could be found and gunfire was still exchanged in disputed areas along the 7,500-km-long border between the Soviet Union and China. Both the Soviet and Chinese sides deployed large numbers of troops along their borders, and the two nuclear armed countries frequently fought against each other there. Immiment danger hung in the air all the time.

Against this backdrop, the changes taking place in recent years along the borders has become more convincing. In the past five rounds of border negotiations, both sides have settled nearly 90 percent of their borderline. During the latest round of talks, which just concluded in Moscow, both sides initialed an agreement on the eastern section of their borders. In short, a large amount of technical work has been done.

However, I believe that establishing peace and tranquillity along the border areas is more important. Troops stationed along the borders were not only reduced but also retrieved from the borderline. Contacts along the borders are thriving. Various republics in central Asia have established relations with Xinjiang. The oblasts and coastal areas in the Soviet Far East have expanded cooperation with the northeastern provinces of China.

In his speech to the Japanese Diet not long ago, Gorbachev emphatically pointed out that the Soviet Union and China were the first countries in Asia to reduce their troops and take measures to boost mutual confidence along their borders. Many other Asian countries followed suit afterwards. For example, Mongolia improved its relations with both the Soviet Union and China. The various fighting parties in Cambodia came to the negotiation table. No more crossfire was exchanged along the Sino-Vietnamese borders. The knot binding the Korean issue, which was bound very tightly in the past, began to loosen a little. Evidently, countries in the Asia-Pacific region are closely watching the development of closer Sino-Soviet relations. Moscow and Beijing are no longer depicted by the media in these countries as horrifying monsters.

Finally, Kondratyev said: I believe the alleviation of tension along the Sino-Soviet borders not only will benefit the Asia-Pacific region but also the whole world.

Defense Minister Yazov To Visit PRC in May

LD3004130991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1230 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Apr (TASS)—It has been officially announced here that Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Yazov, USSR Minister of Defense, will visit the People's Republic of China on an official visit at the start of May of this year at the invitation of Colonel General Qin Jiwei, minister of national defense of the PRC.

Northeast Asia

DPRK Paper Critical of Gorbachev-No Summit

PM0105100991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Multifaceted Line": "NODONG SINMUN (DPRK)"]

[Text] The newspaper NODONG SINMUN, organ of the WPK [Workers Party of Korea] Central Committee, has published an article entitled "One-Act Show on Cheju Island" under the "Observer" byline.

The talks are viewed as the result of attempts by No Tae-u "to lure the guest returning empty-handed from his visit to Japan and thereby at all costs to isolate and stifle" the DPRK.

The indignation of the NODONG SINMUN author was aroused by No Tae-u's calls for assistance for "perestroyka" and the "opening of doors" in North Korea. The newspaper viewed this fact as attesting to Seoul's attempts to "undermine the socialist system" in the DPRK.

Here too the organ of the WPK Central Committee writes that the South Korean Government is seeking an "eternal split" in Korea in the international arena, meaning the ROK's desire to join the United Nations. Condemning the ROK president's appeals to the USSR to support these efforts, the newspaper emphasizes that the question of UN membership must be discussed exclusively "within the nation."

Summing up the DPRK's attitude to the summit meeting between the USSR and the ROK, the organ of the WPK Central Committee writes that it was "the result of empty promises to grant major dollar credit beyond South Korea's means under the present conditions" to the USSR. However, the newspaper continues, "conspiratorial relations based on money cannot exist for long, and sooner or later they will burst like a soap bubble."

The article also speaks of the DPRK's attitude to the USSR president, about whom the local press has in recent days been publishing critical items citing a number of foreign news media.

ROK's Yi Sang-ok's Japan, U.S. Trips Viewed

SK0105074591 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 24 Apr 91

[By commentator Sergey Petrov on the ROK Foreign Minister Yi Sang-ok's visit to Japan and the United States, from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Today, on 24 April, the ROK Foreign Minister Yi Sang-ok's visit to Japan and the United States will begin. In Tokyo, he will hold talks with the Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama, Taro. Discussions on the issue of relations between the ROK and the Soviet Union, and Japan and the DPRK will be held.

In this regard, station commentator Sergey Petrov writes as follows:

In the talks which will be held in Tokyo and Washington, attention will be turned to the Soviet Union's proposal to hold discussions on preparing to conclude a treaty on good neighborly relations between Moscow and Seoul.

According to reports, President No Tae-u ordered the ROK foreign minister to carefully study this and hold discussions regarding this matter when talks are held with the Soviet foreign minister.

Seoul plans to examine the opinion of the ROK allies in advance regarding the plan for concluding the treaty. Moscow's change from a hostile attitude to active cooperation, may at first seem to be a surprise.

In my opinion, the ideological point of view regarding the development of relations between close neighbors has been logically expressed.

The future treaty to be concluded between the Soviet Union and the ROK will not be detrimental to any third country such as the United States, Japan, or the DPRK. This treaty will not be the same as the existing friendship treaty between the Soviet Union and the DPRK. Therefore, Tokyo and Washington will be able to support the plan put forth by the Soviet president in Cheju Island.

During the visit to Japan and the United States there are other issues to be discussed by the ROK foreign minister. This includes the official talks between Tokyo and Pyongyang to normalize relations which started last January.

Seoul is not indifferent to this matter. Minister Yi Sang-ok will use the meeting with Nakayama so that the Japanese side will consider the ROK's interest during talks with Pyongyang.

On the other hand, Tokyo is closely observing the development of relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK. What is due the ROK has far more importance against the background of the delayed economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Japan.

Not long ago Japan said that Siberia and the Far East can be developed without any natural resources. However, due to the rapid contact between Moscow and Seoul, Japan has become a secondary partner of the Soviet Union among Asian countries. ROK officials claim that this cannot occur but Tokyo cannot ignore this possibility.

According to reports, Minister Yi Sang-ok's visit to Washington is necessary to settle the date for President

No Tae-u's visit to the United States and to hold discussions regarding the issue of the ROK's entry into the United Nations.

Finally, I would like to say that the situation in the Asia and the Pacific region is also greatly dependent upon settling the ROK issue. With regard to this issue, the new relations between the Soviet Union and the ROK can be a key element.

Time will tell whether it would contribute to creating the atmosphere of cooperation and trust, if the other countries of the region act with them.

ROK Agrees To Exchange of Military Attaches

LD3004131891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] The Soviet Union and South Korea have reached an agreement on the mutual exchange of military attaches. It is planned that it will take a month to complete all procedures, including the appointment of personnel.

PRAVDA Runs Gorbachev Tokyo News Conference

PM2404120791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 5,6

[PRAVDA headline: "USSR—Japan: On the Way to New Relations. M.S. Gorbachev's Press Conference in Tokyo"]

[Text] Tokyo, 19 Apr—Good evening, esteemed ladies and gentlemen and comrades, the USSR president said to the journalists who had gathered in the Japanese Press Club long after midnight. In Moscow it is still evening, he explained, so I am taking the liberty of putting it like this. On the other hand you could say: good morning.

The visit to Japan is drawing to a close. It was long awaited both by the Soviet Union and by Japan and even before it began, the world press and the press of our two countries assessed it in various ways, even called it historic, and they constructed predictions. Indeed this is the first Japanese-Soviet summit on Japanese land in one-and-a-half centuries of diplomatic relations. At the same time, an end has been put to the abnormal situation, whereby the leaders of the Soviet Union and Japan did not meet even in the years of perestroyka —a time of the most intensive international contacts and the firm establishment of new principles of world policy.

Behind us we have three days of work, and intensive, frank, and, I would stress, generally benevolent dialogue. There has been a large-scale thorough discussion on key aspects of Soviet-Japanese relations and important world problems. And yet, problems of bilateral relations and a peace treaty probably took up about 80 percent of the whole time of the talks. We did not avoid any controversial points in our discussion and did not hide behind evasive phrases.

This also concerns the question—complex and sensitive for both sides—of a peace treaty, including territorial demarcation. The Soviet leadership is approaching this question, like others too, in the broad context of bilateral relations, taking into consideration its significance for both countries, the region in question, and the world as a whole. From all viewpoints we need a genuine breakthrough in Soviet-Japanese relations, which both sides desire, as I have seen for myself as these three days have gone by. We also have to bear in mind the fact that in recent years changes have taken place that have embraced the European continent and such a key field of world politics as Soviet-American relations. Without these it would have been hard for us to count on the changes we are seeing at all. Furthermore, the processes of making international relations more dynamic have also embraced the huge Asian-Pacific region.

We are affirming with satisfaction the growth of dialogue and cooperation in all forms with the PRC. Relations, cooperation, dialogue, and the degree of trust have also moved on to a new level with India; and active ties, and particularly political dialogue were struck up with Indonesia, other ASEAN countries, and Australia and New Zealand. In general, there is much still to be said about what is happening in this region. We have established diplomatic relations with South Korea. And somehow the state of relations between the Soviet Union and Japan that you have observed up to now did not fit in, and looked like an anachronism. I think that both from the point of view of bilateral interests and from the point of view of world politics this is abnormal

In 40 years we have managed—the Japanese for their part, and we for our part—to prove that we can live without each other, maintaining relations without particularly moving them forward, or extending or deepening them. But now, when the whole world is busy reinterpreting what is hapenning and saying good-bye to the "cold war," we believe that it is abnormal that our relations were in this state.

All this has prompted me to leave all domestic affairs—you know about them. I have recently had to reduce the volume of work connected with foreign policy to a certain extent, and nevertheless I deemed it necessary—and this is the opinion of the whole Soviet leadership—to make a state visit to Japan, regardless of the whole complexity of the situation.

So, we are here, in Japan. Six meetings, and if you bear in mind that two had breaks, then eight meetings lasting 12 or 14 hours—I haven't managed to count them yet. In general this is a kind of record worthy of the Guinness Book of Records. Once again we felt that we both have to accommodate one another and seek the keys to new relations.

The Soviet Union is geared to a resolute improvement in relations with Japan. To be blunt: We are neighbors and

we will remain neighbors. Two great peoples, two important world powers in this changing world cannot continue with that kind of mutual relations. And everything favors our cooperation. On the threshold of the 21st century, we have to think about the fact the burden that is weighing down these relations should be left behind. In any case I am satisfied with the work carried out here. At the end of the day, having agreed on our positions, we were finally able to make a joint statement.

And we signed a whole package of agreements concerning various spheres of cooperation. I see the result as a major achievement, and the breakthrough in our bilateral relations can be placed on the plane of realpolitik. We can now talk about this with greater conviction. But everything still lies ahead. Politicians will clarify this, journalists will discuss and argue about what happened here, what you can really say about it, whether exaggerations have been made here, or if it is euphoria, if it is a breakthrough or something else, whether the entries in the documents match political opportunities, and so on. There will probably be many discussions and both we and the Japanese side have something to think about here. Nevertheless, both of our peoples will welcome the positive results of this visit. In all the polls in our country, 75, 80, and 83 percent of those polled support an improvement in relations with Japan, express well-disposed feelings toward the Japanese people, and respect their diligence and modesty.

It is also important that noticeable improvements are also taking place in Japanese society. The KYODO agency gave me the following figures from a poll carried out in conjunction with TASS. Even not long ago 14 or 16 percent of those polled in Japan supported extending cooperation with the Soviet Union and now the figure is over 43 percent. That is, in a short period the attitude has changed. And the task of politicians is to express this mood of the two peoples and find ways of making policy more dynamic.

Taking advantage of the opportunity, I would like to say that as direct contacts with the inhabitants of Tokyo have shown, the people have truly displayed friendliness and a great interest in the visit, and were sincere toward us. This is wonderful. I express heartfelt gratitude to the Japanese people for their hospitality and cordiality, I assess as constructive the attitude of the government and the leaders of political parties, and I am grateful to them for everything they have done on the eve of the visit and within its framework.

Then M.S. Gorbachev answered correspondents' questions.

MAINICHI SHIMBUN. I would like to ask you about the solution to the problem of the northern territories. What accord was reached concerning the four islands—Kunashir, Iturup, Shikotan, and Habomai? I heard that this problem occupied an important place in the talks during all seven rounds. What were the main points of conflict?

M.S. Gorbachev. I will not talk about our discussion in detail, as this would take too long. I will just say something about its results. We held thorough in-depth talks on a whole complex of questions concerning the elaboration and conclusion of a peace treaty between Japan and the USSR, including the problem of territorial demarcation, taking into account the sides' positions on the ownership of the Habomai, Shikotan, Kunashir, and Iturup islands.

During the meeting, the extreme importance of speeding up work to complete the preparation of a peace treaty was stressed, and the firm intention was expressed to act constructively and dynamically with this aim in mind, using the positive experience accumulated in bilateral talks in various years, starting in 1956 when Japan and the USSR jointly declared the end of the state of war and the restoration of diplomatic ties between them. That is the result of discussion on this question.

As you can see, here we have both a realistic policy and recognition of past and current realities. There is a position and a common desire to speed up work to conclude the elaboration and conclusion of a peace treaty, there is a mention of 1956 when the end to the state of war and the restoration of diplomatic relations were declared. Let me say straight away, without waiting for a question, why there is no mention of the "declaration." We took from that document not just what went down in history but also what acquired legal force and international legal consequences. And as for the things that did not happen, when the opportunity was lost, and history turned out differently, we could not reanimate the second half of the document over 30 years later. Therefore we assess 1956 in the right way and believe that what was done then is also a positive achievement from a lengthy and difficult period of search for paths toward a peace treaty.

The advance made is enormous. Back in 1986 talks and contacts on this question were very simple. And they did not take up eight discussions many hours long, but roughly eight minutes. The Japanese side demanded that we return the lands, and we said that the territorial question does not exist, and everything was clear. Now this document testified, on the one hand, to the fact that we have come a long way, and on the other hand, that we will act on the basis of experience, within the framework of realpolitik and that we will look for a solution to the problems on the basis of a balance of interests. Experience of the past few years has shown that history must be its own master. And history, as is known, has the following feature: One moment it slows down, the next moment it speeds up. If there had been no Moscow Treaty with the FRG and the subsequent whole package of treaties with other countries, if the GDR and the FRG had not become members of the United Nations, if the Helsinki process had not been concluded successfully and had not continued, if large-scale relations with both German states had not grown, the new thinking would scarcely have appeared in the Soviet Union and we would scarcely have got involved in associated processes

which made it possible to get involved in the Paris Charter and the processes that unfolded in Eastern Europe.

In a word, this is always a very complex process, and one way or another, depending on the way circumstances merge, history always reveals its possibilities amid new cooperation and a greater degree of trust.

I think that this experience and our own experience of bilateral relations with Japan, and experience in other areas of world policy helped us to accommodate one another. I think that this document presupposes an increase in cooperation in all spheres, including the economy. Of course this will change our relations and move them onto a new level, and make dialogue deeper, extend the exchange of people and knowledge. In the final analysis, the whole structure of these relations will also change in a cardinal way. Then it will be easier to look for answers to all these questions, and history can engage another gear.

What will it look like? Let us not guess, let us work. I am confident that mutual understanding, cooperation, and trust not only on a political, but also on a human level, will give us a great deal.

Soviet television. Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have just mentioned the Paris Charter. Speaking there, you said that new relations need to be established between the USSR and Japan, without which the creation of a zone of cooperation in the northern hemisphere is inconceivable. How are the results of your visit to be assessed on this plane?

M.S. Gorbachev. I think that from this point of view too the results will work toward improving the situation in this region, particularly since my contacts with a great many countries in this region in recent years are displaying a great interest in changes here. This does not mean that everything will be repeated, or copied, or that the European model will be implemented fully. I think that if we took that path, it would quite simply be the wrong one, it would mean artificially dictating some kind of forms and methods. Here the situation will develop in its own way. On the one hand the roots of our civilization are here, there is a great deal of wisdom here, the history of the peoples of these countries has accumulated a huge potential. On the other hand this is a region where there are the most problems, a region which is backward to a significant degree.

This means that the experience that we have been accumulating in recent years must be applied here with the realities, features, and traditions of this region taken into account, and this presupposes collective efforts. We do not want to act as though we were playing a particular card or claiming a particular role. No, we are inviting everyone to cooperation and a joint search. And if the United States does not participate in this process—and following my speeches in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk, someone somewhere came out with the idea that this is an attempt to drive a wedge between the United States and the countries of this region—then nothing will happen here. And in the same way nothing will happen at all in two areas of world policy without the participation of this enormous state and the American people. And I thought in exactly the same way about the fact that a huge economic role belongs to Japan. New states are emerging and they are gathering speed in their development. And I thought about the fact that two such states connected with this region—the Soviet Union and Japan—will consult each other and not just improve bilateral relations, but also cooperate with other countries. We also had a discussion on this.

Mr. Kaifu shared his immediate plans as regards imminent visits, including visits to important countries in this region. I think that all this will work for the improvement of the general situation and perhaps for the slow but neverthless growing potential for cooperation here. I advocated the idea that the five—the United States, China, India, the USSR, and Japan think about their role, and what they can do. Once again I supported the idea that the foreign ministers of this area meet in 1993 and sum up a kind of balance and the preliminary result. And this is not a question of creating structures and institutions all at once in this whole enormous region. The point is to look for these paths. A large sphere is the search for trust. An enormous military potential has been built up here, and it is here that the problem of naval forces is perhaps the most topical. In general, there are many questions here.

TASS. Mikhail Sergeyevich, today a joint statement and a large package of measures have been signed, and as you have said, we can expect a big breakthrough. I would like to hear from you how you see the outline of the further development of relations between the USSR and Japan.

M.S. Gorbachev. I think that the documents exist, the legal base has been created, and we have agreed that now the relevant organizations on the Japanese side and on the Soviet side will devote themselves to fleshing out and implementing the provisions that have been formulated and agreed. And at the same time these actual documents, particularly the main one—the joint statement—stress in particular the need and expediency of urgent actions. That is why departments will have to work hard now and I think that now these provisions have to be transferred to a practical plane. On the basis of the results of this visit, I intend to issue a special decree containing instructions on all these questions.

Question (unknown correspondent). Mr. President, you spoke in parliament about the danger of dictatorship in the USSR. When you return to Moscow, what concrete steps will you take in order to achieve national accord, and with which leaders and which forces are you prepared to meet?

M.S. Gorbachev. I am talking about the speech in the Japanese parliament, and you are taking me back to the Soviet Union. Yes, the situation in our country today is such that there is a real danger and a threat to the state,

the economy, to the common market, and to political stability. I have spoken a great deal about this in the past few days, and since you are familiar with this, I will not go into detail. I would just like to confirm that we have to remove political differences between parties and movements, and everything that is connected with the activity of one party or another or a group of one kind or another, or a social group of individuals, and place common interests above everything else.

I think that today we are faced with the task of saving the state. I see the key to this in the speedy conclusion of work on the Union treaty. I have scheduled a meeting with the leaders of republics that have held a referendum. They asked me to do this urgently and this meeting will take place 23 April. One of the leaders said that we must not leave until the smoke comes out of the chimney, which is what happens at the election of the pope, or until we reach agreement on all the main questions. This is one way, and it is the most important way. A great deal is happening as a result of the fact that there is some kind of suspicion between the center, the republics, and departments because there is a process of redistribution of powers, or decentralization, going on. And this is connected with the violation of the normal functioning of the system of power and the struggle of laws, which is disrupting all social and economic life and is affecting law and order in the country. Therefore the conclusion of the Union treaty is the key question. That is the first thing. We must finish this work in the next month or two.

The Supreme Soviet, all the republics, all leaders, various parties, scientists, scientific institutions, and Supreme Soviet deputies have been sent a Cabinet program, a program of anticrisis actions, specifying what is planned for the upcoming months, and this year. This is a very serious program, the second directive in overcoming the crisis and achieving stabilization in order to remove social tension. And the point is not even the danger of the actual possibilities of clashes within the framework of political struggle. In the final analysis this is normal. The danger lies elsewhere. It lies in the fact that some people, aspiring to some position in society, or in the state, are seeking power. They may play various cards. And particularly the social tension card. That is where the danger lies—in the current state of the market, and the fact that economic ties have been ruptured and production has become disorganized. People are stressed now, they are very critical of the processes taking place, and of the way the authorities are behaving. And you can put a match to this, so to speak, like to a kerosene lamp. But it is only irresponsible people that could do this now. Unfortunately there are such people. This must be avoided, and every possibility to take advantage of the tension in society and draw the people into rally fever, and particularly into strikes, must be stopped.

In Khabarovsk I decided to walk about the streets and try to get a feeling of the mood of the people, what they are going through, what they are thinking, for myself. People are prepared to unite in the continuation of perestroyka and the speediest solution to questions connected with overcoming the slump in production and with getting the market to start to function more quickly, and they are prepared to be patient and stand firm. But they want changes, they demand order and resolute actions. Resolute actions and dictatorship must not be confused here.

Strong authority, and resolute actions on the part of the authorities within the framework of the constitution and the law is normal, and is actually a sign of democracy. And if the law does not triumph and the authorities cannot operate, what kind of democracy is this? This is ochlocracy, chaos, and anarchy. Democracy presupposes strong power, based on the law and on the people's support.

When you write about the Soviet Union you must always try not just to scoop the "hot story" but also to reflect on what is happening in the Soviet Union. I hope that like us you all want perestroyka. Because this is not just our perestroyka, and it is not just we who need its success. It is also your perestroyka, and you need it to be successful, because a great deal—our common future—is linked here. Perhaps we now feel, more than ever before, that we are members of one civilization. Yes, we are different, but we are all united and we understand that we need one another. We want to unite constructive forces on the basis of values common to all mankind, patriotism, and the preservation of everything that is most important and the main thing for every people and every state.

KYODO. The Japanese people were hoping that as a result of the visit at least two islands would be returned. Can we count on this?

My second question concerns the new relations of trust which you said must be created in the Asian-Pacific region. What can you say about the Soviet Armed Forces in the Far East, in particular the Armed Forces stationed on the four northern islands?

M.S. Gorbachev. I have tried to give an answer in principle to the first part of your question. Everything else will be clarified by the process of talks which will be continued in the immediate future on the basis of agreed approaches. As for the second question, the question of trust, and in this connection, of the USSR Armed Forces in this part of the Soviet Union—first of all, I think that you have all noted that we are fulfilling all the obligations we have taken on ourselves recently. As you know, we have achieved much with China. We have withdrawn forces from Mongolia. Short-range nuclear missiles have been eliminated, intermediate-range ones will be destroyed by the middle of this year, as well as 16 surface ships and submarines. We are not building up nuclear weapons here, we are not building up the numerical strength of troops. In order to show our good will and demonstrate that we do not want to make the process of talks regarding the peace treaty into some kind of screen, and that we are really in a frame of mind to get involved

in realpolitik, we have stated that in the immediate future we will implement measures to extend contacts between the Japanese population and the population of the aforesaid islands, to establish a simplified system whereby Japanese citizens can visit these islands without visas, to establish joint mutually advantageous economic activity in this region, and to reduce the Soviet military contingent stationed on these islands.

ASAHI SHIMBUN. Mr. President, after visiting our country, you will meet South Korean President No Tae-u on Cheju Island. What significance will this meeting have for detente on the peninsula? And another question. Do you have plans to visit North Korea in the very near future?

M.S. Gorbachev. We are satisfied with the fact that we have established diplomatic relations with the ROK. In my opinion they have started developing very dynamically to our mutual satisfaction both as regards dialogue and as regards concrete forms of cooperation, including economic cooperation. We have discovered that we have great possibilities for increasing this cooperation. And it seems to me that the fact that we are preserving, maintaining, and developing relations with the DPRK, is positive in every respect. It is positive in that it is making a contribution to establishing constructive dialogue in the search for ways to resolve the problems on this peninsula, which would be in line with the hopes of the Korean people. And on the other hand this will also be significant for our cooperation in this region. We now have many new ties, many new documents have been signed with states in this region, and we think that this is our contribution to normalizing and improving the atmosphere in this region. I have plans to go on an official visit to North Korea; I have an invitation and I will definitely make use of it.

Question (unknown correspondent). Mr. President, what steps are you going to take next in the matter of resolving the Near East problem? Will Mr. Bessmertnykh go on a tour of the Near East in the near future? Has the Japanese side made a pledge to help in some way in perestroyka on an economic level?

M.S. Gorbachev. The first question. We think that our role will be just as active. This can be seen in our contacts with the leaders of other countries, particularly with the U.S. President and secretary of state, and with the leaders of Arab countries.

We feel responsibility, understanding, and a wish and desire to assist in the resolution of the problems connected with the Near East conflict. The first phase of this cooperation and collaboration will obviously embrace all the problems connected with getting out of the crisis in the Persian Gulf. But evidently questions concerning all the problems of this chronic Near East conflict will emerge in the future and we will address the problems that require solutions. I have in mind the Palestinian question, the question of the return of Arab territories, the future of Lebanon, security, and the confidence in the future of the Israeli state and its citizens. Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh will visit this area in the very near future.

As for the second part of the question, then, first of all, in the past few days we have heard very well-grounded, well-reasoned, sincere support for perestroyka from the Japanese Government, official circles, leaders of practically all political parties, from parliament, and public circles. We regard this as a manifestation of the solidarity of the Japanese people and the Japanese leadership with our enormous and important but difficult work. On the other hand, concrete questions of implementation and searches for new forms of cooperation in various directions were discussed. The 12 documents we signed already broach these questions partially, but Mr. Kaifu and I also deemed it necessary, within the framework of the joint statement, to make the following entry side by side with questions connected with speeding up work on a peace treaty: At the same time it was deemed expedient to develop constructive cooperation, in an atmosphere of good-neighborliness, mutual advantage and trust, in mutual relations between Japan and the Soviet Union, including the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] which borders directly on Japan, in the trade and economic, scientific and technical, and political spheres, at the level of the public, in the fields of culture, education, tourism, sport, and through broad and free communication between citizens. So there are political provisions, very important ones, which give guidelines to the various Japanese social groups and business circles. Steps have been taken in concrete fields of cooperation—in particular the package of documents signed contains an agreement on technical support for perestroyka and implementing perestroyka en route toward the market.

PRAVDA. Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have just been talking about a breakthrough in Soviet-Japanese relations. Can we believe that this breakthrough will now take place in economic relations, in that Japan will give us assistance in creating a market, an infrastructure, banks, and so on? Not just agreements, but an economic breakthrough. Or is the Japanese side continuing to make this dependent on the development of political relations?

M.S. Gorbachev. The discussion centered on this theme. But I would like to be precise: We have yet to make a breakthrough. I only said that what has taken place during these days will enable me to believe that it is possible for there to be a breakthrough in our relations on all directions. And it seems to me that previous experience has convinced us of the fact that if one of the sides advances prior conditions in the form of an ultimatum, then nothing will come of it. That is why I said: You know, I recognize the formula "politics and economics," but only on condition that politics affects economics and economics affects politics. And that is why a breakthrough will not occur there just in one specific field. A breakthrough will be guaranteed if

relations are made more dynamic in all fields, and particularly in the political field and the field of economic cooperation.

SEUDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG. Mr. President, you have given us to understand that the solution to problems between Japan and the Soviet Union should represent a balance of interests. I would like to return to the territorial question and ask you how you envisage a compromise. What areas of compromise have you in mind?

M.S. Gorbachev. I do not intend to put myself in the position of negotiator on these questions, but I will try and give you a answer in principle. We must seek a balance of interests and we must seek compromise.

It seems to me that we and the Japanese have lost a great deal by presenting each other with various preconditions and rigid positions carved in stone. Since there is a problem you cannot avoid it. It has to be discussed and examined. Now we have started to understand the fact that that is how you have to operate. But you know, I have learnt from my own experience—and I came to the same conclusion by studying past experience—that the most dangerous and unproductive occupation, particularly in high-level politics, is when a cabinet outlines some kind of model plan and then attempts are made to impose it artificially. This has happened to us, particularly in our history. When I am sometimes told that there is no general idea, no model, then I hold quite a thorough discussion on these questions. Yes, there must be a choice, the aims must be oriented and determined. And in other respects there must be a joint search on the part of the parties participating in a particular conflict or interested in resolving a particular problem. And this is always best resolved when the situation changes and when an atmosphere of trust emerges. As soon as the European world changed, Soviet-American relations changed, disarmament processes began, the theme of the priority of values common to all mankind appeared, and thus the situation changed, and straight away it was easier for us to fit the keys to Afghanistan, Cambodia, Namibia, and South Africa. But the Persian Gulf frustrated our searches in the Near East. This means that the situation and the atmosphere have to be changed and a different level of trust has to be created. And I insistently proposed this to my partners here at the talks. It is important that we are saying: Yes, we must devote ourseles to a peace treaty, yes, we must also include the problem of territorial demarcation, and that this may be best resolved in a different situation, with relations of a different nature, with greater mutual dependence and linkage [svyazannost]. I can conceive too of the option that these relations may acquire such a character when these questions stop being perceived in such an acute and painful way as they are being perceived now. Academician A.N. Yakovlev, who is here, is part of the official delegation with me. Once during a discussion here in Japan he said: Listen, why do you keep asking me questions about the islands? I am putting forward a proposal and I believe that all the Soviet leadership will support it. Let us think about cooperation between Japan and the Soviet Union in developing the Far East and Siberia. You can imagine the territories we are offering you. That is how the question could turn. If it turns around like that, then we will cooperate, and travel, and act, there will be joint enterprises, and maybe concessions [kontsessi], and so on. The milieu will be different and we will look at many questions in a different way. That is what my train of thought has been. We need to move toward new relations more boldly.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospects for Cambodian Peace Settlement Examined

PM3004154591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

[V. Ganshin report under the rubric "Panorama of International Life": "Hearing the Voice of Your Partner. Another Attempt at a Cambodian Settlement"]

[Text] Following USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's meetings and talks with Japanese and ROK leaders, and the report on the visit to our country by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, political scientists and journalists have expressed the following opinion: The center of gravity of Soviet foreign policy is shifting to Asia. In this connection, it would hardly be wrong to include on the list of these contacts, so extraordinarily important for our country, the talks in Moscow between USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and his Cambodian colleague Hor Namhong.

A real chance for the implementation of a political settlement of the Cambodian problem, which was deadlocked for many years, emerged six months ago following the adoption of the well-known UN plan. However, despite the generally positive assessment of this initiative, the variety of aims pursued by the conflicting sides essentially brought the possibility of reaching a compromise on the proposed conditions to the brink of failure. Several formulas offering scope for various interpretations (for example, about UN supervision of the sides' disarmament), as well as the lack of what Phnom Penh considers to be highly principled statements condemning the policy of Pol Pot genocide, provoked serious objections from the Cambodian Government.

On the other hand, the well-known disparity between intentions to resolve the conflict by political means and practical steps in this direction urged the opposition in the form of the "Khmers Rouges" to again try to change the balance of forces to its own advantage by military means. Now, with the support of the cochairmen of the Paris Conference on Cambodia, the United Nations apparently again intends to take the initiative. Well, this is corroborated by the opinion of several specialists who had said earlier: Without direct intervention by the great powers and other countries which are involved to varying degrees in the conflict, it will hardly be possible to reach a settlement. Both the Soviet Union, which has its own interests in this region and is linked to Vietnam

and Cambodia by a number of treaties and commitments, and China, which gave direct assistance to the opposition all these years, can influence to a significant degree the course and pace of dialogue between Phnom Penh and the opposition. U.S. policy on this question will become increasingly active. Some of Washington's initiatives, in particular its intention at the final stage of the Paris Peace Conference, to publicly condemn the Pol Pot genocide, and also to refrain from granting financial assistance to the groupings of Sihanouk and Son Sann, are capable of "breathing" new life into the Cambodian settlement.

The next meeting in Jakarta, in which the cochairmen of the Paris Conference and members of the Cambodian Supreme National Council will participate (it is supposed to open in May), might provide an answer to the following question: Are the sides prepared to reach accord and implement the UN plan in practical terms? It is believed that if the conflicting forces voluntarily agree to a cease-fire starting 1 May this year in accordance with the UN appeal, then it is quite probable that the Indonesian meeting will not be held in vain. After all, you can hear the voice of your partner in the talks better when the weapons are silent.

Meeting of Thai, Cambodian Premiers Viewed

BK0105041291 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] On Sunday, Comrade State of Cambodia Prime Minister Hun Sen met in Bangkok with Thai Prime Minister Anan Panyarachun. Following are comments by our observer, Comrade (Kiril Mikhailov).

It was after medical treatment in Tokyo that the Cambodian Prime Minister arrived in the Thai capital for a two-day visit. During the stay in Tokyo, along with the medical treatment, Comrade Hun Sen also met with Japanese officials and discussed various issues relating to a solution to the Cambodian problem. These issues were also the focus of the meeting in Bangkok, the first between the two countries' prime ministers since the coup in Thailand. I would like to recall that in this coup, the military toppled Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan, a personality well known for his activities to assist in the cause of a Cambodian solution. It has been two months since that coup and apparently Bangkok has no intention of giving up its role as mediator among various Cambodian parties involved in the conflict.

Speaking at the Foreign Correspondents' Club in the Thai capital last Friday, the new Thai Prime Minister promised to continue the policy adopted by his predecessor of transforming Indochina from a battlefield into a market. It was at then that people learned about Anan Panyarachun's meeting with leaders of the opposing Cambodian group. It is indeed in Bangkok that leaders of the tripartite opposition group have issued a statement saying they are ready to provide a positive response to the appeal by the cochairmen of the Paris International Conference on Cambodia and the UN Secretary General for a temporary cease-fire starting 1 May. This appeal was supported by many countries, including the Soviet Union.

It is clear that the meeting of Cambodian parties, planned in Jakarta in mid-May, will be more successful and fruitfull if it is unaccompanied by the sound of gunfire. During the meeting with Anan Panyarachun, Comrade Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen revealed that government troops will be ordered to stop all kinds of operations from 1 May. Comrade Hun Sen also expressed the hope that at the Jakarta meeting, the difference of views among Cambodian parties concerning the UN framework document will be solved.

By intensifying diplomatic efforts to end the war in Cambodia, circles in Thailand are thinking about the region's future. In Thailand's view, a peaceful solution would soon be achieved. At that time, the regional situation will no longer be determined by the rules of battlefield but by the rules of market. This was also discussed by the two prime ministers at the meeting in Bangkok. Anan Panyarachun expressed the hope that if the situation in Cambodia is comprehensively solved, the country will be able to attend, in October this year, the annual conference of the World Bank and the IMF in Bangkok. In the Thai Prime Minister's view, these two organizations can ensure possibilities for realizing programs to restore Cambodia after the war ends.

Near East & South Asia

Bessmertnykh on Chance for Mideast Peace

AU3004081391 Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 29 Apr 91 p 5

["Exclusive" interview with USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh by NOVOSTI correspondent Vladimir Markov; place and date not given: "Using the Chance for a Middle East Settlement Now"]

[Text] [Markov] In view of the lively travel diplomacy of U.S. Secretary of State Baker there arises the question: Has the role of the USSR in the Middle East diminished?

[Bessmertnykh] It had hardly become known that James Baker intended to go to the Middle East, when advisers and experts recommended to me to go to the region myself. However, I am not a fan of "diplomatic ostentation" according to the slogan: If Baker is there, we must also go there. On the contrary, I think that a certain restraint is more important for Soviet diplomacy. And—U.S. diplomacy did not act in isolation from us. We have discussed many questions jointly, not to speak of the intensive contacts with many Arab states, with the Palestinians, and with Israel. Thus, shortly before my talks with Baker in Kislovodsk, I met with members of the PLO Executive Committee in Moscow.

Diplomatic activity must not be judged just by the number of trips. At the beginning of May, when I will

visit Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and one or two other countries, I will travel with different luggage—with a precise concept, with solid preparatory work, with the knowledge of the limits, the positions, and the scope of the maneuver. Thus, one cannot say that we are less active than the United States. And if the Americans are intensively striving for cooperation in this respect, this also shows our important role in the Middle East settlement.

[Markov] Is there a real chance at all for a conference to settle the conflicts in the region?

[Bessmertnykh] We agree with the United States in believing that such a chance exists, and maximum use must be made of this opportunity. Failure to use this chance contains the danger of an unpredictable development. Now we are jointly doing intensive detailed work for a formula on the basis of which the process of settlement could be started. A platform must be found that links the standpoints of all interested sides. I say frankly: Not everything works smoothly. Therefore, we had the meeting in Kislovodsk.

I hope that we will be able to sound out more thoroughly the opinions of all participants in the future Middle East conference and to come to an agreement on this conference. All Arab countries involved in the conflict, Israel, and the Palestinians should take part in it—with the participation of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Nations, and the Europeans, because we are in favor of including them in this process.

Basically, the Soviet Union favors a multifaceted basis for the process of solving the conflicts. If the questions are settled that cause concern for the various sides, this conference can be a very good start. For this it needs a solid foundation. Already before the conference begins, we all must know exactly in which stages the settlement is supposed to take place. It will surely stretch over several years. A comprehensive international conference on settling the Middle East conflicts could then be the culmination of this process, in my view.

[Markov] Israel makes the USSR's cochairmanship at the conference dependent on one condition—the resumption of diplomatic relations between the two countries.

[Bessmertnykh] Actually, there cannot be any preconditions for the cochairmanship of the conference. The USSR and the United States jointly chaired the Geneva conference on the Middle East in 1973 when we not only did not have any diplomatic relations with Israel but also had no consular relations. Second, we are approaching the resumption of diplomatic relations with Israel. Our position is: As soon as we reach the tracks of regulation [Regulierungsbahnen], there is no reason for us not to establish such relations. By the way, Israel's restraint in the Gulf crisis is a point in its favor.

In my view, one of the important aspects of the Middle East settlement is the necessity of stopping the arms race in this region, stopping arms deliveries to the region, and establishing a security system. This also includes confidence-building measures, close economic cooperation, and the solution of environmental problems. And the countries of the region are also interested in guarantees for steady oil deliveries.

IZVESTIYA on Results of Kislovodsk Talks

PM3004092991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA diplomatic correspondent M. Yusin report: "Results of Talks in Kislovodsk. USSR Agrees To Cochair Near East Peace Conference"]

[Text] The situation in the Near East was the main item on the agenda during Thursday's four-hour talks in Kislovodsk between USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker.

In the opinion of Soviet diplomats who took part in the talks, the main result of the Kislovodsk meeting is the attainment of an accord that the United States and the USSR will cochair an international peace conference on the Near East. Thus, Moscow accepted the Americans' idea of holding this forum, manifesting, to Baker's satisfaction, greater flexibility than Israel and a number of Arab states.

Foreign agencies note in their commentaries that the USSR's agreement to participate in the conference is effectively the only palpable result of the secretary of state's 10-day foreign tour. Neither Syria, Jordan, nor Israel, whom Washington also expects to enlist in the conference, have hitherto given a definitive answer, despite Baker's desperate efforts. Only Egypt has said that it will take part in the conference—something that came as no surprise since Cairo's territorial dispute with Israel was settled back in 1979 with the signing of a peace treaty.

Another important problem discussed in Kislovodsk was the differences between the USSR and the United States on the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe signed in Paris last November. The United States and its allies, as is well known, are accusing the Soviet Union of trying to save some combat hardware from the cuts by transferring it to naval infantry and coastal defense forces. Until this problem is settled Washington refuses to conclude with the USSR a treaty on strategic offensive arms cuts, on whose readiness for signing the dates of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting depend to a considerable extent.

According to a U.S. diplomat whom REUTER and AFP cited without giving his name, it proved possible in the course of the talks to resolve a considerable proportion of the contentious issues connected with the interpretation of the Paris treaty. This diplomat claims that only one of the three stumbling blocks effectively remained after Kislovodsk—not the most important one either.

Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, confirmed that "appreciable progress has been made" in the conventional arms sphere. He also said that the question of the date of the summit was touched on in Kislovodsk "in most general terms."

TASS reported 25 April that Aleksandr Bessmertnykh would visit Israel in May. However, the minister himself, answering journalists' questions at the close of the Kislovodsk talks, only said that his tour of the Near East is scheduled for early May and it is still too early to say which countries it will involve. The Foreign Ministry does not rule out the idea that Israel might be one of the stops in the trip. Apparently Bessmertnykh will also visit Syria, Jordan, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia. However, the final route will be announced in a few days.

As for the Israelis, they are talking of Bessmertnykh visiting Tel Aviv with 100-percent certainty. "The Soviet foreign minister's visit to our country will be an important phase in the normalization of Israeli-USSR relations," Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir said. People in Tel Aviv, as in Moscow, prefer not to say whether the restoration of full diplomatic relations between the two countries—relations that were broken off in 1967—will be announced in the course of the visit.

Latest Round of Baker Mideast Diplomacy Viewed

PM3004151391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA correspondent D. Velikiy report: "J. Baker Sees Improvements"]

[Text] Cairo—U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's third diplomatic tour in the last two months, designed to formulate an Arab-Israeli settlement acceptable to all interested parties, has come to an end. After visiting the Soviet Union, the U.S. secretary of state once again set off for Israel after which he immediately left for the United States due to his mother's death.

How have J. Baker's diplomatic efforts been rewarded? Can we talk about positive progress in the highly complex Near East situation and have the chances of holding a Near East peace conference increased?

Baker himself answers these questions in the affirmative. There are improvements, he said during his visit to Israel. The region's press links the above improvements above all with the Soviet agreement to take part in the peace conference. Egypt's leading AL-AHRAM, for instance, writes that this decision to a considerable extent clears the way to a peace settlement, removing a substantial obstacle. Egypt has already expressed a desire to take part in the conference, the USSR will now, in all probability, be among its participants and it can be hoped that Jordan will also join in.

But what about Israel? I telephoned my colleagues at Israeli Television in West Jerusalem. People in Israel greeted with extreme optimism the Soviet Union's decision in principle to take part in the regional conference, political observer Ye. Yari [name as transliterated] told me. As well as the imminent prospect of restoring full diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel. In this connection people here are impatiently awaiting Soviet Foreign Minister A. Bessmertnykh's coming visit

As for the conditions that Israel sets for its participation in the conference, only its position on Western countries has changed officially. Tel Aviv has agreed to their representatives participating in the meeting. Unofficially, as my interlocutor said, reports are filtering through from Prime Minister Y. Shamir's immediate entourage of Israel's readiness to broaden its understanding of the aims, tasks, and form of a Near East conference and not reduce it merely to a ceremonial opening and immediate transformation into bilateral talks between Israel and the Arab states. However, Israel's reluctance for the conference to be held under UN auspices—this position strictly conflicts with Syria's opinion—is still totally unchanged. Tel Aviv still refuses point-blank to discuss returning East Jerusalem, which it occupies, or the possibility of dialogue with the PLO.

As for representatives of the occupied territories, after their meetings with J. Baker, which the PLO authorized, they noted their utility and advocated continuing these kinds of consultations and exchanges of opinions, which make it possible to clarify the sides' positions in detail and conduct constructive dialogue. By and large the Palestinian delegation, to all appearances, may show some flexibility if, of course, it glimpses Israel's readiness to take countersteps.

U.S. 'Buildup' in Northern Iraq, Turkey Viewed

PM3004132791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

[A. Pavlov article: "Whom the GI's Are 'Guarding.' United States Builds Up Military Presence Near Soviet Border"]

[Text] It is becoming increasingly obvious that the Gulf crisis cannot be considered settled even now that hostilities between Iraq and the U.S.-led multinational forces have ended. It is not for nothing that the Soviet Union, convinced that a military solution of the Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict would only spark off a new phase of confrontation in the region, proposed exploiting every opportunity to find a political way out of the complex situation. However, many people were somewhat more impatient to use weapons...

What do we have now? Certainly, the amir of Kuwait is once again on his throne. But we must not forget the hundreds of thousands of dead and the devastation of the economy of Iraq—one of the major Arab countries, whose inhabitants are facing starvation and epidemics. Although some people may approach this problem with different yardsticks: The United States and its closest

allies have obtained a long-sought opportunity to reinforce their military presence in the region, new forms of state-of-the-art weapons have been tried out, and U.S. monopolies have obtained levers to control world oil prices.

Against this backdrop the sufferings of the Kurdish people, who have for the umpteenth time fallen victim to foreign strategists' ambitious plans, do not seem that important to many people. Reports have appeared in the Western press to the effect that the United States, seeing that its military victory over Iraq had not brought about S. Husayn's overthrow, resorted to secret operations, inciting the Kurds to mass action against the central authorities. This was not that hard since, admittedly, the Kurds have lived in Iraq for many decades now in a state of oppression, in conditions of poverty with extremely neglected education, health services, and social security. However, expectations that Kurdish armed detachments would be victorious in the struggle against the Iraqi Army were not realized, it did not prove possible to remove S. Husayn, and as a result many hundreds of thousands of Kurds, forced to break away from their home areas and seek sanctuary in Iran and Turkey, have ended up in a tragic position.

Under these conditions a new scenario has emerged. As if nothing had happened, the British, followed by the Americans, have assumed the noble role of "saviors of the Kurdish people," totally disregarding the fact that the Kurds would not have ended up in this critical position had it not been for their involvement. Further, as Western food aid increased, the presence of U.S. and allied troops in northern Iraq has also taken hold, on the pretext of safeguarding the refugee camps.

Moreover, no secret is being made of this. Thus, Britain's ITN television, citing the opinion voiced by a number of U.S. politicians, indicated that the United States will maintain its military presence in Iraq north of the 36th Parallel as long as Saddam Husayn remains in power. It cannot be denied that this is an extremely vague timeframe.

Of course, we are bound to be alarmed by the fate of the Kurdish people. It would certainly be right, despite the difficulties we are experiencing, to somehow react to the Kurds' calls for humanitarian aid. Ultimately, we ourselves have also availed ourselves of it of late with increasing frequency.

But there is also another very important side to the problem that worries us. I am talking about the systematic buildup of the U.S. military presence in areas directly adjoining our borders and the unstable Transcaucasian republics. We cannot fail to take into consideration the fact that an infrastructure designed for use by U.S. rapid response forces has already been set up and is being reinforced in eastern Turkey. We are receiving reports that the numerical strength of U.S. military personnel at bases in Turkey is being increased, these bases are being equipped with increasingly modern equipment and hardware, and additional weapons supplies are being stored there. It is also a question of bases located in eastern Anatolia (Mus, Bataman, Erzurum) just two or three kilometers from the USSR border. We now have the latest step in the same direction: Some 10,000-15,000 Western servicemen—mainly crack U.S. subunits—intend to settle long-term in the Iraqi-Turkish border region.

Our relations with Turkey are certainly developing extremely favorably. I would like us to be good neighbors in the future also. But Turkey is, after all, still a loyal U.S. ally and an active member of NATO and, were there to be any changes in the world arena, this factor would definitely play its part. We must not forget that Soviet-Turkish relations were not calm from the early-1950's through the mid-1970's and were frequently exploited by the U.S. special services in order to infiltrate their agents.

These are the realities that should be taken into consideration if we are guided by common sense and objective assessments of the consequences of the "settlement" of the Gulf crisis according to the U.S. scenario.

Kurd Solidarity Group Meets Iraqi Kurd Front

LD3004170191 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 30 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS— "The Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee calls for halting the extermination of Kurds in Iraq and appeals to international governmental and public organisations and people of good will to do everything possible to restore peace and tranquillity in that country," Alexander Kislov, deputy chairman of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Commmittee, said at a meeting with representatives of the Iraqi Kurdistan front today.

The delegation from the front is headed by member of the front's leadership Mahmud Osman. Representatives of the Soviet public, orientalists and Kurdish students under study in the USSR attended the meeting.

Osman noted that the Kurdish people were now going through one of the most tragic pages in their history. The Iraqi authorities are pursuing the policy of genocide against "Kurds. Women, old men and children are dying daily. About two million people were forced to flee the country. About a thousand people die of cold, hunger and diseases every day.

On recent talks between Kurds and Iraqi authorities, Osman said Kurds put forward three main demands. They insist that Kurdistan's autonomy status be implemented on the basis of constitutional rights, Iraq be democratised and international guarantees be given for a treaty with the Iraqi leadership.

"We favour a peaceful and political settlement of the problem and hope that talks will be successful. But we also want guarantees for a peaceful life from the international community," Osman stressed.

Osman spoke about the actual support lended to Kurds by the United States, Britain and France and asked the Soviet people for help. The Soviet peace fund, despite economic difficulties currently experienced by the Soviet Union, has recently set aside 365,000 roubles for the purchase of tents, medicines and food "for Kurdish refugees.

Speakers at the meeting emphasised the need to achieve as soon as possible a political solution to the Kurdish problem, that would ensure a free, peaceful and secure life to Kurds.

Russian Deputy Says Tanks Exported to Iran

LD3004121691 Berlin ADN in German 1148 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The Soviet Union is now exporting tanks to Iran. The Sverdlovsk URAL-SOVIETIY news agency reports today that this was announced by Vladimir Seryakov, a Russian deputy and general director of the "Uralvagonzavod" manufacturing association, at an election rally in the town of Nishniy Tagil. He said that in the near future his enterprise would sell "several dozen" tanks to Iran; the enterprise supplied tanks to Iraq before the Gulf war.

East Europe

Albanian Foreign Minister Interviewed

PM3004141591 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No. 14, Apr 91 (Signed to Press 2 Apr 91) p 27

[Interview with Albanian Foreign Minister Muhamet Kapllani by special correspondent Gennadiy Sysoyev in Tirana, "Specially for NOVOYE VREMYA"; date not specified; first paragraph is introduction: "We Are No Longer What We Were Before, Albanian Foreign Minister Muhamet Kapllani Reckons"]

[Text] Tirana—Albania's new foreign minister, Muhamet Kapllani, gives virtually no interviews because of lack of time. But he made an exception for NOVOYE VREMYA's correspondent. M. Kapllani is no newcomer to diplomacy; he speaks fluent English and gives the impression of being a sociable, uncomplicated man.

[Sysoyev] What are the priorities in Albanian foreign policy today?

[Kapllani] There are three main areas now: the Balkan, Mediterranean, and European. They all merge within the basic framework of the Helsinki process. Thanks to this concept, a new concept of international relations founded on security for all has prevailed in Europe and bloc confrontation has become a thing of the past.

[Sysoyev] But one bloc still exists...

[Kapllani] NATO must be disbanded irrespective of the persuasiveness of the arguments advanced in favor of keeping it.

[Sysoyev] Albania sees obtaining the status of a full-fledged member of the CSCE as a highly important foreign policy goal. How do things stand as regards this task.

[Kapllani] I see no obstacles to us obtaining the status of a full-fledged member of the CSCE. Over the last few months we have fulfilled all the conditions, including the last—the holding of multiparty elections. Europe must realize that we are no longer what we were. Although, needless to say, it is pure fantasy to think that Albania will join the European Community in a few months. The road to Brussels is a long one and will obviously take years.

[Sysoyev] Your country attaches great significance to Balkan cooperation as one of the real ways to Europe. How do you view cooperation in the Balkans from Tirana?

[Kapllani] In our view, extremely modest progress has been made in Balkan cooperation. Talks have as yet failed to produce tangible results. There is still no proper trust between countries in the region. The problem of national minorities, which has become a "burning issue" throughout Europe, has not been settled either. Deideologization has resulted in a vacuum in many countries which has been filled by nationalism.

There are also problems in Balkan cooperation because some states in the region fail to show particular interest in it, in an endeavor to join the EEC somewhat quicker. Although, in my view, organized cooperation in the Balkans is the best password for every Balkan country knocking on the doors of the European community.

[Sysoyev] In your opinion, what are the prospects for relations between Moscow and Tirana?

[Kapllani] A 30-year break preceded the resumption of Soviet-Albanian relations. This gap has to be filled. We are ready for that. Cooperation, above all in the economic and cultural spheres, has the most favorable prospects in our relations.

Romania's Iliescu Defends New Treaty With USSR

PM0105091991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

[Correspondent V. Volodin report: "Must We Cross the Prut?—Ion Iliescu on Soviet-Romanian Relations"]

[Text] Bucharest—President Ion Iliescu met with representatives of the press in the "yellow room" of the

former royal palace, now the residence of the Romanian head of state. President Iliescu touched upon the Soviet-Romanian Treaty of Cooperation, Good-Neighborliness, and Friendship, which was signed recently in Moscow and which provoked varied reactions from the Romanian press.

"The treaty with the USSR is an important document based on international legal norms," the president noted. "Some ask: Why the rush? We were not overhasty—this treaty was under preparation for a whole year. Others are confused: Why are we the first? But nobody asks themselves why Romania was the first to abrogate the old treaty. Many are indignant: Why does the treaty enshrine the inviolability of the borders? But you know this fully corresponds to the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act and the Paris Charter for a New Europe," the Romanian president said from the dais of the "yellow room."

Iliescu rejected the accusation ringing out from the pages of many Romanian publications that the Soviet-Romanian Treaty actually requires Romania to renounce Bessarabia and recognize the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, and that it contains certain secret articles.

The next day, the newspaper ADEVARUL wrote: The majority of questions related once again to the Soviet-Romanian Treaty. Moreover, it became clear that many of those who have asked questions are not just unfamiliar with the text published in the press but have not even read the lengthy commentaries on the treaty."

Again, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact floated to the surface. Questions emerged on what will happen if parliament fails to ratify the treaty. A journalist from ROMANIA LIBERA investigated the prospects for declaring Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina occupied territories and the possibility of pressuring the Soviet Union through the United Nations.

"It is absurd to think that tension in relations with the USSR will stand our cousins in Bessarabia in good stead," the president answered. "Maybe you are going to suggest that we declare war against the Soviet Union. Calls to cross the Prut (a river on the Romanian-Soviet border—V.V.) have already been heard. Only I do not understand in what—tanks or armored vehicles? But this iron doesn't float very well..." I. Iliescu smiled.

However, I do not think the news conference pleased the president who, not long before this, had been appealing to journalists to spare a thought for the image that Romania presents to the world.

CSFR's Havel Cited on New Treaty With USSR

PM3004190191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, POST-FAKTUM, REUTER roundup: "CSFR President's Statement"]

[Text] President V. Havel of the CSFR stressed when addressing a news conference in connection with the new treaty in preparation between the CSFR and the USSR which is to replace the 1970 Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance: We do not want to enter into any alliance aimed against the Soviet Union, we do not want to undertake anything against the USSR. In this regard he pointed out that there is hope of achieving consensus on the two contentious paragraphs in the draft treaty. As for paragraph three, which, on the USSR's suggestion, envisages that for the duration of the treaty no one side shall join a security alliance aimed against the other country, this wording is unacceptable, in his opinion, because it restricts the CSFR's freedom to make decisions for a protracted period. In this connection the president recalled that the CSFR wants sooner or later to become a member of the EC, which is preparing a political union which will contain elements relating to the safeguarding of security.

Hamburg Daily Reports Honecker Back in Moscow

LD2904161191 Berlin ADN in German 1547 GMT 29 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Hamburg (ADN)—According to BILD newspaper (Tuesday edition), the former GDR head of state and party, Erich Honecker, is back in Moscow. He only spent a few days at the Air Force hospital in Krasnogorsk. Then he was taken back to his old accommodation at the pilots' hospital at Sokolniki Park in Moscow. There he is living strictly isolated from the public and all other patients, the paper reports with reference to well-informed circles in Moscow. The military authorities in Krasnodarsk did not tolerate the stay of the prominent patient in their hospital. [passage omitted]

Honecker's state of health has improved slightly. He is taking a 30-minute walk every day. During that time all other patients and hospital personnel have to leave the party, which cannot be overseen from outside. During his walks Honecker is always accompanied by two KGB officers.

West Europe

Pavlov Returns to Moscow After Brussels Visit

LD3004133691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1150 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Apr (TASS)—USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov returned to Moscow on 30 April after an unofficial visit to Brussels. He held talks with Belgian Prime Minister Wilfried Martens, and Jacques Delors, chairman of the European Community Commission; had a meeting with prominent politician and former French Prime Minister Raymond Barre; and took part in the inaugural sitting of the "Moscow Club" international public organization.

Pavlov Interviewed on Visit

PM0105093191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov by correspondent V. Peresada in Brussels 30 April; first paragraph is introduction: "Although the Visit Was a Short One. USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov Answers PRAVDA Correspondent's Questions"]

[Text] Brussels, 30 Apr—USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov, who was paying an unofficial visit to Brussels, returned to Moscow 30 April. He had conversations with Belgian Prime Minister W. Martens and EC Commission Chairman J. Delors, met with the well-known politician and former French prime minister R. Barre, and took part in the inaugural sitting of the "Moscow Club" international public organization. He gave PRAVDA's correspondent an interview before leaving.

[Peresada] Your visit to Brussels was a short one, but your schedule indicates that it was extremely intensive. What is your opinion of the results?

[Pavlov] The meetings with Belgian Prime Minister W. Martens and later with his two deputies can be described as key meetings. We primarily discussed our bilateral relations. I would remind you that, even during the "cold war," Belgium always tried, I would say, to "breach the wall" and extend a hand to the East. Major mixed associations have been in operation here for many years now with our participation and over the last few years 30 Soviet-Belgian joint ventures have been set up on USSR territory. Therefore, in the endeavor to step up our cooperation with Western Europe, we decided to turn to our traditionally good relations with this country.

I would stress that we met with mutual understanding and a readiness to embark on providing the USSR with considerable practical aid. Moreover, not at some point in the future, but today, here and now.

[Peresada] Could you tell us in this connection the specific subjects you discussed?

[Pavlov] The insurance ceiling on export credit to the Soviet Union has been raised significantly here (it is roughly 13.7 billion Belgian francs). The decision has already been made, but I asked them, in view of the situation in the USSR, in particular the food situation, to agree to change it somewhat and transfer some of the limits from investment to credit for consumer goods deliveries. This question will be examined.

We discussed to our great advantage the subject of cooperation in the sphere of motor vehicle and tractor building and agricultural machinery with the intention of keeping production at our plants fully occupied.

Lastly, the Belgian side demonstrated its readiness to look favorably on potential for new forms of cooperation with the Soviet Union. I will not go into details now, I will only say that they are nontraditional forms of support for our country that Belgium has never used before.

[Peresada] You also had a meeting at the Brussels headquarters of the EC Commission—the "Common Market" executive body. Was it constructive too?

[Pavlov] Yes, my meeting with Commission Chairman J. Delors was both concrete and very useful. We agreed, in particular, that nonrepayable EC aid to the USSR totaling 250 million ECU [European Currency Units] (roughly $350 million), above all food aid, will begin to arrive over the next few days, at least no later than mid-May.

We also discussed a number of fundamental issues linked with the technical aid that we are being given (worth 400 million ECU this year). We discussed the need to correctly organize its use in the Soviet Union and the appropriate linkup here. If we succeed in doing this, the EC Commission is willing to consider the possibility of increasing the amount of aid next year. On the whole the prospects look like this: If we can make effective use of this aid, it may be increased to quite a large amount and develop into a joint long-term venture to retrain our cadres in the new conditions of economic management.

[Peresada] It is somewhat unusual for a Soviet prime minister in the course of a visit to also have dialogue directly with business circles from various West European countries...

[Pavlov] I consider this dialogue to be of fundamental importance. Traditionally, people in our country generally act on the premise that questions of economic ties should be "taken to the top" without fail. But in market conditions, if you want to settle these questions rapidly, extensive opportunities open up thanks to direct contacts with entrepreneurs because it is ultimately they who execute the decisions. And a very great deal depends on them. That is why we have to learn to create a business climate "from below" and learn horizontal ties. And we need new structures in order to organize these ties. We do not have these structures as yet—neither joint societies of entrepreneurs, say, nor business clubs where people exchange opinions and can, incidentally, also adopt decisions.

That is why we had meetings here with both Belgian and other West European business representatives. It was decided in principle to set up the "Moscow Club"—an organization aiming to promote the development of economic relations between the Soviet Union and Western Europe. The partners' intention to carefully work out and prepare its legal base attests to their serious approach to this. The club's inaugural sitting effectively took place yesterday in Brussels, and I think that the first working sitting may be held in November.

Gorbachev, Kohl Discuss Treaties on Telephone

LD3004141691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1353 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Apr (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl today resumed the telephone conversation they began a week ago. They expressed satisfaction over the ratification, now nearing completion, of the Soviet-German treaties which have initiated a new epoch in relations between the two peoples and states, and they confirmed their determination to implement the agreements in practice. A number of issues demanding urgent solution were touched upon in this regard.

Opinions were exchanged on major events in the life of the Soviet Union in the past few days. Mikhail Gorbachev talked about the progress of final revision of the anticrisis program with the participation of all the republics. He evaluated highly the position of support for the transformations in the Soviet Union that the German chancellor is asserting in the world community.

They agreed to continue the conversation soon.

FRG Low-Key Reception of Georgians Viewed

PM0105104591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 91 First Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent Ye. Grigoryev under "Apposite Comments" rubric: "En Route From Tbilisi"]

[Text] Although the city of Bonn is not very large, it has many visitors, and of various kinds. Recently a delegation came here from Georgia, headed by G. Khostariya, the republic's foreign minister.

The guests from Tbilisi were interested in establishing economic, but at the same time also political contacts. In particular, the minister called on the federal government to set up direct multilateral links with Georgia. However, representatives of the FRG Government avoided meeting the delegation or its head. Nevertheless, the minister stated at a press conference that he had had "useful economic negotiations." Among these he mentioned certain "specific projects" with German firms.

The minister considered his main task in Bonn to be to counteract "disinformation" about the state of affairs in Georgia. Incidentally, even the German press quotates the word 'disinformation.' Recently the German press, and television broadcasts as well, have featured quite a lot of material testifying to the violation of democratic norms and freedoms and also human rights in that republic. Khostariya rebutted, for example, journalists' charges of the persecution of Ossetians.

According to the Georgian minister's assurances, the USSR government is backing Ossetian "extremists" and "provocateurs." And in general Moscow is responding to Georgian proposals with "obstruction, aggression, and economic blockade." As a further argument to refute the "disinformation," reference was made to the imposing external appearance of the guests themselves: As you can see, the representatives of the independent Georgia "are by no means cannibals." These words are cited by German newspapers.

There was also diplomacy. "Germany," the minister declared, "has always had great significance for Georgia. The greater part of the Georgian intelligentsia received its education in Germany." Strange: Until quite recently we supposed that the representatives of Georgia were educated mainly in Moscow, Leningrad, and other Union university centers. But the claims that the majority were educated abroad are simply an unsound tactic. Of course, they love compliments here. But all the same, they keep their own interests at the center of attention.

Representatives of the republics have now become quite frequent guests in Germany. Recently L. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, visited Munich and Bonn. He had conversations with a number of FRG leaders. The Ukraine, as is well known, maintains links with Bavaria. As for Georgia, the latter also has long-established links with the Saarland, particularly in the form of partnership links between Tbilisi and Saarbruecken.

The FRG supports the development of broad and useful links between the federal laender and the republics. The main priority, however, is given to the broad development of relations with the Soviet Union and the maintenance of close contacts with Moscow, notably in security interests, disarmament, and collaboration between our two countries in solving international and global problems. This fact has been stated openly here and has been mentioned in conversations with representatives of republics who at times have tried to claim special attention.

Latin America & Caribbean

Castro Blames Economic Ills on External Events

PM3004145191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 91 p 5

[S. Sereda report: "No Oil—Get Pedaling. Following Fidel's Appeal, Cubans Tighten Their Belts and Switch to Bicycles"]

[Excerpts] Havana-Moscow—The "special period in peacetime" which the Island of Freedom is experiencing is rapidly changing the appearance of Cuban cities. Since the Soviet Union, which cannot cope with its traditional international aid to Cuba, was forced to reduce by at least one-fourth the volumes of fuel shipped across the ocean, ever-increasing numbers of vehicles on the island are being laid up, giving way to bicycles in the streets.

The first lucky people to gain access to the alternative means of transport were students—as the section of the population most susceptible to crisis phenomena. [passage omitted]

The food situation is, unfortunately, roughly the same as the gasoline situation. Residents of the capital, primarily young people, have to be sent regularly to carry out agricultural work. From last June through this April more than 100,000 Havana residents worked in the surrounding fields.

Mobilized city folk traveled to agricultural jobs "only at critical times for gathering the harvest"—a situation perfectly familiar to us too. Sixty-six camps providing the necessary minimum comforts have already been constructed in the environs of Havana for those mobilized for "agricultural breakthroughs." In what way, incidentally, is the experience not positive?

There is also a catastrophic fuel shortage in fulfilling the food program. But, in Fidel Castro's catchphrase, the Cubans are "ready to plow the land with oxen and ride bicycles" in order to get through the hard times and not waive their principles.

The country is living through an extremely crucial time. On the 30th anniversary of the battle at Playa Giron, known in the West as the Bay of Pigs intervention, Fidel Castro delivered a traditionally long speech in which he admitted that the economic situation in Cuba is continuing to become more complicated. At the same time he emphasized that it is certainly not the Cubans who are to blame for this. "We bear no blame for the mistakes made by others," he said. "We bear responsibility for our history and our mistakes, but we cannot be considered responsible for mistakes and reactionary ideas, for the ideology of capitalism and imperialism, or for the fact that other socialist countries have begun to weaken ideologically and politically."

It has become incredibly difficult for the Cubans to trade with the Soviet Union. According to data publicized in one of Fidel Castro's previous speeches, "Cuba must sell 26 million tonnes of sugar at present prices to compensate for deliveries of the 13 million tonnes of oil a year which the republic needs." But in recent years we have been receiving 4.5 million tonnes from Cuba, and it produces, in all, 7-8 million tonnes of sugar per season.

How can one not rack one's brains here, particularly as all foreign trade used to be under the jurisdiction of the corresponding ministry in the USSR, whereas what is the position now? "With how many Soviet enterprises will we have to discuss delivery terms?" Fidel Castro exclaimed in his last speech. "How many will there be—10 or 20,000? Many of them understand very little or nothing at all about trade."

But, despite all winds, Cuba is holding out. So as not to make unsubstantiated statements, I will venture to cite the leader of the Cuban revolution one last time: "Today we are a symbol. The eyes of the whole world and of all people who live for progressive ideas and hopes of a better world and of salvation for the ideas of socialism are turned on us."

Supreme Soviet

More on Pavlov 23 Apr Responses to Deputies

PM2604100591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

["Events and Comments" report by A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "The Deputies Ask Questions, the Prime Minister Answers"]

[Excerpts] Kremlin—[passage omitted] And the day before, 23 April, the two-day parliamentary hearings of the anticrisis program presented by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers for the session's ratification, were concluded. [passage omitted]

The evening sitting began straight away with the prime minister's concluding remarks. [passage omitted]

Practically the whole speech was devoted to answers to deputies' questions. There were a great many of these questions. However, the speaker tried to organize them so that he answered the most important and crucial questions. And, judging by the reaction of the audience, V. Pavlov did so successfully. Here are some excerpts of what might be called this press conference for deputies.

[Unidentified deputy] What is the government's attitude to the demands made by the miners and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers to transfer the coal industry to Russian jurisdiction, and why is the process of the de-statization of this sector not being speeded up?

[Pavlov] The question does not just relate to the miners. We must accept and comprehend the process of de-statization in unequivocal terms. This is not a question of changing labels. The most dangerous thing that could happen in our country would be if we yet again reduced crucial changes in production relations to switching labels. The Supreme Soviet has adopted all the laws and I believe it adopted the right ones. What is this about? If an enterprises wants to stop being under the jurisdiction of a particular authority, it has the right to do so. But if we put up a sign saying "RSFSR Ministry of the Coal Industry" instead of "USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry," then what will change in the country?

[Unidentified deputy] What stage of examination has the question of removing the sales tax reached?

[Pavlov] There are various points of view about this. As I see it, the correct view is that we are not yet ready to send this down for full examination by local organs of power. Evidently we overestimated their responsibility and initiative in this respect. I think that the union organs should at least establish a minimum list of goods that do not have to be subjected to a sales tax. The rest is the affair of the local authorities. Evidently the mistake of the central organs of administration is that they did not specify this minimum list. Obviously we will do everything we need to in this sphere in the immediate future. This list will contain first and foremost commodities for children, and everyday food products.

[Unidentified deputy] Is the government prepared to buy extra grain from agricultural workers, not for rubles, but for consumer goods and agricultural equipment?

[Pavlov] Yes, at the moment it is prepared to do this. But in principle I personally believe that this is wrong, this is not the right way or the right method. Buying certain individual commodities for hard currency within the country is wrong. Yes, we are prepared to do this out of necessity, quite simply because we have to eat today. But this is not the right way or the right method.

[Unidentified deputy] What extraordinary measures does the government propose for maintaining a mutual relationship between the growth in earnings and the growth in production?

[Pavlov] In 1991, maintaining relations between the growth in earnings and the volume of production is the only solution to the problem of preventing inflation from escalating today. We favor controllable inflation. The ways of controlling it are varied, the methods are varied, and not everyone likes them, but if you look at them from a global position, then we simply cannot get by without this. And here there is also a direct question for the USSR Supreme Soviet. After all the USSR State Bank comes under your authority. The government unfortunately cannot give orders either to the USSR State Bank or to republic state banks. If you want my opinion, then frankly you were too hasty with this decision. I am deeply convinced that we need to introduce a state of emergency in the sphere of banks and finances. To put banks directly under government authority. If we do not do this we will be unable to stop inflation.

[Unidentified deputy] How and when will the barriers that local authorities are putting up in the movement of commodities be removed?

[Pavlov] It would be best if the people who put these barriers up removed them. An accord was reached and everyone signed an agreement. But if they are not carrying it out, then the problem lies in something else—give us the right, and we will establish order. In this hall you have often reproached the Cabinet of Ministers for exceeding their authority! If you let us we will organize things and we will do it successfully.

[Unidentified deputy] Why has the government enlisted support against barter deals?

[Pavlov] Barter deals are a way of robbing the country, they are underhand actions. This is an attempt to get round tax legislation and state interests and line your pockets with money that does not belong to you.

[Unidentified deputy] When will the government present a draft law on the indexation of income?

[Pavlov] As we were instructed, we presented the USSR president with a draft decree on the basket of consumer goods. The draft law on indexation can be submitted to parliament before 1 June.

[Unidentified deputy] What is your personal attitude to the proposal made by the "Soyuz" group on the immediate introduction of a state of emergency in the country in order to carry out the program to bring the economy out of the crisis?

[Pavlov] I would not introduce it throughout the whole country. I would do it in spheres such as power engineering, for instance, and transport, banks, taxes, individual regions (flexibly, by introducing it in certain places and then revoking it), and I would introduce it immediately.

[Unidentified deputy] Does the government's proposal on suspending all programs which have not started being financed by 1 June, include the Law on the Provision of Pensions to Citizens?

[Pavlov] This only concerns investment programs, and there is no plan to suspend environmental and social programs. The market is the market, of course, but we will protect the people who are not protected against the market. [passage omitted]

Girenko Chairs Nationalities Panel Sitting

PM2604151991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At CPSU Central Committee Commissions"]

[Text] A routine sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Nationalities Commission chaired by A.N. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was held 23 April.

It heard reports on the results of an analysis of republic legislative acts on sovereignty, on practical steps to safeguard human rights unconditionally, and on a mechanism for providing ethnic minorities with legal protection on questions relating to their representation in organs of power at all levels. Cognizance was taken of a report from representatives of a number of party committees on their accumulated experience of working to meet ethnic minorities' national and cultural demands. M.G. Aliyev, L.E. Annus, P.P. Anspok, L.I. Dyshlevich, G.I. Yeremey, B.M. Zumakulov, N.Ya. Kiryanov, M.F. Melikova, V.F. Khishba, D.N. Khudonazarov, and V.S. Chertishchev spoke at the commission sitting,

Questions of the commission's further work were discussed.

Soviet of Nationalities S. Ossetia Resolution

PM3004104591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 91 Union Edition p 3

[USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities resolution dated 24 April 1991: "On Proposals To Normalize the Situation In and Around South Ossetia"]

[Text] Having heard and discussed the report by the deputies' group that visited the Georgian Republic 8 through 10 April 1991, the Soviet of Nationalities notes that, despite the efforts made by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the country's president and the active operations by USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops subunits to disarm illegal formations and groups, the situation in South Ossetia remains complex and tense. The number of casualties is growing, as is the number of refugees from both the Georgian and Ossetian sides. The bombardments of Tskhinvali City and the oblast's population centers are continuing. Dozens of villages have been looted and burned. Material and cultural assets are being destroyed and South Ossetia's economic and social infrastructure is being devastated.

The Soviet of Nationalities thinks that a final solution to the conflict can be found only on the paths of concord, by political methods. At this dramatic and decisive moment in their history the responsible representatives of the Georgian and Ossetian peoples, who have lived together for centuries bound by blood ties, must show genuine courage and wisdom, cast aside mutual distrust, enmity, and political differences, and act within the framework of the USSR Constitution and international human rights norms. Dialogue must begin immediately in the name of ending the bloodshed, saving people's lives, and establishing peace and tranquility throughout South Ossetian territory.

Deeming fulfillment of the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution of 1 April 1991 "On the Situation in the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast" to be essential, the Soviet of Nationalities resolves:

1. To support the proposal contained in the joint protocol signed by representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Georgian Republic Supreme Soviet on the formation on a basis of parity of a permanent interparliamentary commission consisting of members of the USSR, Georgian Republic, and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviets and with the participation of South Ossetian representatives in order to work out measures to settle the situation that has developed in the region and to supervise their implementation.

To take cognizance of the fact that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has formed an interdepartmental operational commission which has now gone out to the location and got down to work.

2. To deem it expedient to grant the interparliamentary deputies' commission the right to officially inform the public of the situation in the region.

3. To recommend that the USSR president forms a delegation to discuss with Georgian Republic representatives the whole range of political, social, and economic questions.

[Signed] R. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities

The Kremlin, Moscow. 24 April 1991.

Polls Show Less Confidence in Supreme Soviet

PM2604141591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Apr 91 Union Edition p 7

["End of the Week" report by Aleksiy Levinson: "Poll—Useful Advice for Soviets"]

[Text] In March last year and March this year the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion put the question of confidence in soviets of people's deputies at local, republic, and Union level.

Last March, the number who expressed complete confidence in their republic Supreme Soviet was 1.5 times greater than the number expressing a complete lack of confidence, while this year it is 2.3 times greater. Meanwhile, in Russia as a whole a threefold excess was noted, and in Armenia and Uzbekistan—a seven-eightfold excess. There are republics in the east and west of the country where the so-called indigenous population in general did not cast a single vote of no confidence in their parliament. But there are also republics where the native inhabitants are more critical of the elected authorities than the nonindigenous minority.

There are cases of a negative "balance of confidence." In the Ukraine, the number of people expressing no confidence in their Supreme Soviet is somewhat greater than the number expressing complete confidence in it. Belorussia is a good example of how dangerous this can be. For every person expressing complete confidence in the republic Supreme Soviet in March this year, five had no confidence in it. Today, these five are on the streets.

The picture with regard to local soviets is no more cheerful. A year ago, over the country as a whole, the "no confidence" voters were already 2.85 times greater in number than the "confidence" voters. Even now there is a more than a 2.5 times difference. There are exceptions: Estonia or Kyrgyzstan, for example, where for one reason or another the replies reflected a positive balance of faith in the organs of self-management.

The research results force us to ponder the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" But what if there is no confidence in them? The figures show that in the countryside, the small cities, indeed in the very places where local soviets play a greater role in citizens' lives and where their actual power over inhabitants is more significant, trust in this power is less. And this is despite the fact in such places the public traditionally occupies the most lenient stances in our polls, refraining from criticizing the authorities etc. It would seem they are exasperated by the kind of elected representative who finds it easy to win elections "out in the sticks."

The question "To what degree does the USSR Supreme Soviet enjoy confidence?" was first asked in December 1989, and at that time the balance of answers regarding confidence in this institution in comparison with a dozen other institutions of central and local power, including the executive and judicial authorities, was most favorable. For every vote of no confidence there were 6.5 votes of complete confidence. By March 1990 this figure had fallen to 2.3. By October, the number occupying the latter category was still marginally higher than the number occupying the former.

Obviously, last November the proportions evened out, but in December 1990 the number of people with no confidence at all in the highest organ of state power was 1.3 times greater than the number of people who expressed complete confidence in it.

There was a rotation of deputies, the sessions were broadcast. A somewhat renewed body of deputies reacted to the different events in the country's life. The country in its turn reacted to the Supreme Soviet's conduct. When people expressed their opinion in the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion's March poll, it seemed that the process of loss of confidence had halted. Geographically, this process was spread in such a way that the further West you went from the Kremlin the more criticism you encountered, and the further East you went the greater the level of confidence. But overall, the growing predominance of people with no confidence in the Union parliament over those maintaining some level of confidence has continued everywhere.

Thus in the year from March to March, the share of those who consider that the USSR Supreme Soviet enjoys no confidence whatsoever rose by 2.7 times and is somewhat in excess of a quarter of the country's population.

Among two major categories of working people—skilled workers and specialists—this figure reaches one third.

Political & Social

Moscow TV Carries May Day Celebration

LD0105115891

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 0655 GMT on 1 May carries its scheduled live coverage of May Day celebrations in Moscow's Red Square.

As the relay begins, crowds with banners are seen assembled in Red Square before the parade begins. A banner seen near the camera says: "Yes to Democracy, No to

Extremism." The following slogans are also seen during the relay: "Our Strength is in Unity;" "No to Unemployment and Price Hikes;" "An End to Social Demagogy;" "Each Worker Deserves the Pay of a Moscow Soviet Deputy;" "Democracy Means Discipline, Rights, and Responsibility;" "Legislators! No Economic Reforms at the Expense of the Family's Interests;" "We Demand Guarantees for Honest, Diligent Labor;" "Gorbachev, We Need Socialism;" "A Real Wage for Real Work;" "No to a Crushing Taxation Policy;" "The Pavlov Cabinet-Resign;" "You've Set Prices Free, Now Set Wages Free;" "Metro Construction Workers Demand Wages on a Par with Miners;" "We Demand a Law on Indexation;" "We Are Against Schism and Separatism;" "Trade Unions Say No to Unemployment;" "It's High Time."

At 0659 Gorbachev mounts the Lenin Mausoleum. Lukyanov and leaders of Moscow trade unions are also present on the rostrum.

At 0700 GMT M.V. Shmakov, chairman of the Moscow Federation of Trade Unions, takes the microphone. In his speech he outlines the demands of the trade unions to work and to have a dignified life. He speaks against any attempts to pressure the trade unions. Concluding his speech, Shmakov declares the rally open. As he says that Gorbachev and Lukyanov are present there is scattered applause and some booing from the crowd. Shmakov notes that Popov and Yeltsin were invited to attend, but Yeltsin is in Kemerovo and Popov was advised not to attend by the coordinating council of Democratic Russia.

At 0704 GMT V.P. Shcherbakov, chairman of the General Confederation of Trade Unions, begins speaking. He notes various problems affecting the Soviet economy, such as the fact that last year 30 percent of winter crops were not sown. He says the main cause of the troubles is political instability, paralysis of authority and mangement, and the central government's ineffective economic policies. Continuing, he says that trade unions cannot watch all this impassively. He appeals to Gorbachev and all the signatories of the recent agreement with republican leaders to ensure that the program becomes a reality.

At 0712 GMT D. Petrovich, a lathe-worker at a Moscow factory, speaks about how ordinary people experience problems in their daily lives. He criticizes the authorities, particularly for not implementing agreements with the trade unions and housing policies. He adds that the country's leadership must tackle the problems at a roundtable.

Barvenko, a writer, then speaks about problems faced mainly by women with increasing prices and wages that fail to keep pace. She criticizes government economic policies and says that strikes make things even worse. But the government must adopt measures, because otherwise the workers go on strike. Repeal the new taxes, give us social protection, and make hard currency resources available for emergency needs, she asks.

At 0721 GMT O. Denisov, a student, describes the hardships of students. He says they do not want luxury cars, just enough to live on. Politicians should not forget that their old age depends on the youth today, he says. Denisov emphasizes that promises made to students have to be extracted by action. One such action was prevented by special militia units, he says. Concluding, Denisov notes that if nothing gets better the students will take to the streets in their thousands.

During Denisov's speech the television cuts to the May Day celebrations in Alma-Ata, showing people parading through the streets and squares. Back in Moscow, a correspondent mentions the celebrations in Leningrad, and notes that demands in support of the striking miners have been put forward at the Magadan rally.

At 0725 GMT a People's Artiste takes the microphone to speak of the situation in the cultural sphere. She says that it is the responsibility of the state to provide people with a decent living wage for their work. She calls for true Russian cohesion so that the country can prosper. As she speaks, Raisa Gorbacheva is seen briefly among the crowds in the square.

An electrician from a local factory then speaks. He criticizes the way the economic crisis is being handled and, in particular, the price rise. He calls for the total abolition of the sales tax and speaks of the concern his colleagues feel for the future.

As another speaker takes the microphone, the television switches to the May Day celebrations in Dushanbe, where people are shown parading through the streets with banners.

Back in Moscow, the correspondent describes briefly the celebrations in Volgograd.

At 0737 GMT I.Ye. Klochkov, chairman of the Independent Russian Trade Unions, speaks of the role of independent trade unions. He recalls the 11 demands made recently by his trade unions, which were presented to the central authorities. He concludes on the need for accord.

As a Komsomol representative begins speaking, the narrator talks about the economic situation in France, Germany, and Uruguay, going on to mention some of the problems faced by the USSR at present, including earthquakes and interethnic strife, against which background the Gorbachev-Yeltsin exchange of telegrams yesterday offers a ray of hope.

At 0745 GMT Shmakov reads a resolution drafted for the occasion on the trade unions' determination to return to values common to all mankind, demanding the abolition of the five-percent sales tax, rejecting the government's actions which adversely affect the people, and citing the need for decent living standards. He calls for a show of hands. Shmakov says one or two raised their hands against and there were no abstentions.

Shmakov concludes with slogans; everybody applauds, including Gorbachev and Lukyanov on the rostrum.

Next, the crowds move across the square with their banners. The accompanying band appears to be a workers' band, not a military one. The camera moves to show long-range shots of Moscow city scenes and flags atop the Kremlin.

Various pan shots throughout the proceedings show the line-up atop the mausoleum as follows (from left to right): I.Ye. Klochkov; A. Lukyanov; M.V. Shmakov; V.P. Shcherbakov; M.S. Gorbachev. The other speakers stand on the right of Gorbachev.

Shmakov Makes Opening Remarks

LD0105105191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0700 GMT 1 May 91

[Opening remarks by Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov, chairman of the Moscow Federation of Trade Unions, at the May Day rally in Red Square in Moscow—live]

[Text] [First unidentified speaker] Dear comrades: Here in Red Square are representatives of trade union organizations in the capital.

[Second unidentified speaker] At the microphone is Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov, chairman of the Moscow Federation of Trade Unions.

[Shmakov] Esteemed comrades and friends: Today Russia is celebrating its 100th May Day. On behalf of the organizational committee of the rally and of the Moscow Federation of Trade Unions, I greet you and all Muscovites on our day, the day of workers' solidarity. At a time when the country and town are facing a most grave situation, we have come out into this square under the main slogan of the trade unions: Unity, Solidarity, and the Right of the Working People. It is only the consolidation of all constructive and truly democratic forces, national accord, and unity of action that can lead the country out of the crisis. Only the solidarity of the workers can oppose attacks on the unshakable right of people to live in dignity.

We have come to this far from festive rally to speak about our demands and problems, to demonstrate the force and organization of the trade union movement of the town, to defend ourselves and our families from the unbridled rise in prices and not thought out administrative decisions. We advocate radical economic reform, with social guarantees preserved, and the right to efficient labor. We are not begging for handouts. We are demanding the chance to work and earn enough for a dignified life. In market conditions, it is labor that should have the highest value.

We oppose the attempts to restrict and infringe upon the rights of the trade unions. We oppose the use of special purpose military detachments in the fight against the trade unions, as that most democratic Moscow Soviet displayed during the all-Russian protest action on 26 April. We are against the shock increase of prices without the indexation of wages, and against the five percent tax that is so humiliating against this background.

We are against switching the political fight to the factories. The shop floor should not be the subject of political games. We are in favor of an economy and a policy enjoying the trust of the people, founded upon strict observance of all human rights and the free and equal development of all forms of activity.

Permit me to now declare open the meeting of representatives of the trade unions of Moscow held to mark May Day.

Taking part in our meeting are USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. [mild applause, some boos] Gavriil Kharitonovich Popov, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, were invited, but Boris Nikolayevich is in Kemerovo today. According to Popov, the coordinating council of the Democratic Russia Movement advised him not to take part in our meeting. [whistles from the crowd]

Representatives of the governments of the USSR and the republics and representatives of the Moscow City Soviet are present in the stands. They will see and hear everything you want to say today, both from the platform and in your slogans.

I first give the floor to Vladimir Pavlovich Shcherbakov, chairman of the General Confederation of Trade Unions.

Shcherbakov Addresses Rally

LD0105112191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0704 GMT 1 May 91

[Speech by Vladimir Pavlovich Shcherbakov, chairman of the General Confederation of Trade Unions, at the May Day rally in Red Square in Moscow—live]

[Text] Dear comrades: The tradition of marking May Day as the day of the international solidarity of working people has been alive in the world for more than a century now. Throughout the world the working people and their trade unions have been conducting a persistent struggle for their vital rights and interests. Working people bear the heaviest losses as a result of wars and ethnic conflicts, unemployment, and an unthinking attitude toward the environment. Again and again we express our workers' solidarity with the workers of Kuwait and Iraq, who are singed by war, of South Africa and El Salvador, of the occupied Arab lands.

The working people of our country also have a need for worker solidarity. The economy has gone into a deep crisis. Sections, workshops, and factories are coming to a halt. In light industry alone, hundreds of enterprises are

not working because of a lack of raw materials. The work of women, already difficult, is complicated by the increasingly uneven nature of the production process. There is an extremely serious situation in transport and in the enterprises of the metallurgical, chemical, oil and gas, forestry, defense, and other industries. A recession in production means fewer goods, fewer medicines, less power, and fewer foodstuffs. Last year there was a shortage of 30 percent in the sowing of winter crops. Currently the countryside is short of almost one-third of its spare parts and fuel, which means only one thing—if we do not correct the situation, together, then there will be nothing with which to feed the country.

Many people simply do not understand what is happening in the country. There is no war. There is no drought nor crop failure. There is no epidemic, no natural disaster. The people are capable of working and want to do so. We have rich resources and a powerful industry, yet we are talking seriously about famine. People are obliged to take to the streets in order to voice their protest against the sharp fall in living standards resulting from the raising of prices by a factor of many times and in order to defend their rights.

There are several reasons for this. The first and main one is political instability and the continuing disintegration of the state. The country essentially lives one day at a time. This is a destructive state of affairs. The second, and not insignificant, reason is the paralysis of power and administration: The harvest is not reaped, there are delays in transport, there is trash in city streets, the criminal world is blatant. These are signs of disorder, not very far from anarchy and chaos. The third reason for today's situation is the ineffective economic policy, first and foremost of the central government and many republican and local bodies.

Half measures have led to a catastrophic decline in the economy and in other spheres of the lives of working people. Trade unions cannot just fold their arms and observe the development of events. The crisis is painfully hitting the ordinary person, the person not protected by an elevated job position or surplus income. The working people today demand an end to the ruination of the state, that the economy be put in order, and that people have the chance to work and receive decent pay. People demand a high level of responsibility from every official, from the president to the chairman of the rural executive committee. People cannot be fed by fine speeches. Grain crops have to be sown and harvested, heat and fuel have to be provided in winter, hunger and epidemics have to be prevented in the country. The time has come to call to account everyone that is entrusted with power.

Interethnic conflicts are not dying down in the country. People are dying. There are more than 600,000 refugees. In a number of regions, discrimination on ethnic grounds is manifest. People are divided into a first and second class. Working people, the trade unions, demand that the effect of the USSR Constitution be ensured using all laws and means, and that the rights and dignity of people be protected.

The entrepreneurs who are coming into being and the members of parliament who represent their interests have now gone on the offensive against trade union rights, despite the recently adopted law on trade unions. They are preparing to deprive them of many important powers. All I can say is that the trade union committee is being deprived of the opportunity of defending a person when he loses his job, taking away a right that the trade unions have had. This comes before the transition to the market, in advance of real mass reductions in jobs. An unprecedented situation has come about—the country's president defends the trade unions, while a number of people's deputies and parliamentary committees and commissions are advocating pacification of the trade unions, making them tame and obliging. I would like to state quite definitely today that the trade unions will not willingly give up the rights won by the working people.

Comrades: Spring always means a feeling of newness and change, spring means expectation of good things. The joint statement by the country's president and the top leaders of nine republics on urgent measures to stabilize the situation and overcome the crisis is a ray of hope for the assertion of peace, calm, and of a creative working rhythm in our state for many Soviet people. I appeal to those present here, to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and to all the republican leaders who signed the statement, to do everything possible in order for this program to become a reality. Soviet people believe in this. Today everything possible must be done in order to ease the situation of working people to the maximum. We express hope for successful implementation of the agreement between the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the council of the General Confederation of Trade Unions, which will undoubtedly help the social protection of the country's population in the difficult period of transition to the market. Today, on this May Day, the trade union rally of Moscow's workers is being seen by millions of people in our country and abroad. Appealing to you, appealing to the country's working people on behalf of the General Confederation of USSR Trade Unions, I call for solidarity of working people to be comprehensively reinforced. In our difficult times, it is only together, shoulder to shoulder, that the interests of the working people can be defended, and that the country can be preserved and enhanced.

Long live the solidarity of the working people!

Shmakov Reads Trade Union Resolution

LD0105113691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0745 GMT 1 May 91

[Trade union resolution, read by Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov, chairman of the Moscow Federation of Trade Unions, at the May Day rally in Red Square in Moscow—live]

[Text] The trade unions have agreed to adopt a brief resolution, which has been prepared by all of the trade unions. I will read it.

We, the representatives of the trade unions of the capital, on the day of international solidarity of working people, 1 May, declare our determination to defend the economic and social rights of the working people, and to seek from the legislative and executive authorities vigorous actions aimed at finding a way out of the economic crisis. The further disintegration of the production process and the breach of economic links strikes most painfully at hired workers. Only we ourselves, by our own efforts and labor, can stop the slide toward catastrophe and restore lost values common to all mankind. We share the position of the USSR president and of the leaders of the nine republics on preserving a single economic space, a single labor market, and we demand that a worthy value be placed on manpower on the basis of an indexation of the cost of living. We demand from the governments of the country and the republic total abolition of the five percent sales tax and adoption of real measures for combatting unemployment.

Our economic prosperity depends on political stability. Enterprises should be a sphere for the application of labor, not an arena for political struggle. We reject claims by any parties to dictate to trade unions, with whatever democratic clothing they may adorn themselves. We say yes to a law on indexation, no to the antipeople maneuvers of the governments; yes to a well-thought out and effective program for finding a way out of the economic crisis, no to an enslaving taxation policy. May our firmness and solidarity in achieving our reasonable and just aims bring closer the regeneration of the country and provide honest workers with the possibility of living a worthy life.

Who is in favor of adopting our rally's resolution? Please raise your hands. [video shows majority of people in the square raising their hands] Thank you. Is anyone against? I can see one, two. Abstentions? No. We adopt this resolution in the most democratic way. Happy May Day, comrades.

Thank you for your solidarity and for coming to our rally. Our slogan, the main slogan of this rally, is the unity, solidarity, and rights of the working people! The unity, solidarity, and rights of the working people! The unity, solidarity, and rights of the working people! Happy May Day to you and to your families. Whoever tries to prevent us, we and you will always celebrate this festival, the festival of solidarity on the first of May!

Gorbachev, Yeltsin Exchange May Day Greetings

LD3004183791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Now I shall read you some telegrams which have been published in IZVESTIYA.

To USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev:

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, writes Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, accept my congratulations on the occasion of 1 May, the festival of the international solidarity of the working people. I would like to take this opportunity to express confidence that the considerable step that has been taken on the path of drawing the center, Russia, and the other republics together will be suitably developed and embodied in coordinated actions to extricate the country from the crisis and to implement the fundamental changes in the name of the prosperity of the peoples of Russia and the union of sovereign states.

The other telegram:

To Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic:

Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, writes Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, I am sincerely grateful to you for your congratulations on the May Day festival. I share your appraisal of the great signficance of the urgent measures to stabilize the situation and to overcome the crisis that have been set out in the joint statement of the leaders of the Union and nine Union republics. I am confident that constructive cooperation between the Union and republican bodies of power, for which a new beginning has now been laid, will contribute toward leading the country's life on to a normal course. This meets the deep aspirations of all the peoples of our multinational homeland. Accept my congratulations for 1 May.

These are two telegrams published in IZVESTIYA today.

'No Support' for Stalinist Demonstration

LD0105104791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0940 GMT 1 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Yegorov]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 1 May—According to Vladimir Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR General Confederation of Trade Unions, "everything possible must be done to ease the position of the country's working people during the difficult period of the transfer to the market." He was speaking at a meeting in Moscow devoted to May Day, the day of international workers' solidarity. The address by the trade union leader was heard by at least 50,000 people who packed Red Square. [passage omitted]

The general atmosphere at the May Day demonstration and meeting was calm. Most of the slogans were constructive, calling, as they did, for unity and consolidation of society. Even the most sharply worded of them amounted to demands for the population to be provided with social security during the transfer to the market.

Only at the end of the meeting, when the majority of its participants had already left Red Square, did a small

group of people carrying portraits of Stalin gather opposite the mausoleum. They tried to draw attention to themselves with slogans such as :"No to privatization," "Counterrevolution will not succeed," "The Gorbachev-Yeltsin governments of national betrayal must resign," "No to the establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel." When they received no support, however, they soon dispersed.

Radio Rossii Reports Popov Presence

LD0105135991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 1 May 91

[Text] Let me note that TASS, in its report on the meeting on Red Square, did not mention three of the speakers. In particular, TASS failed to mention the speech by Moscow Soviet Deputy Popov, who stated that President Gorbachev has become divorced from the people. This speech was not shown on the reportage on central television.

In addition, the RUSSIAN NEWS AGENCY has told us that their correspondents were not allowed on Red Square.

Gorbachev Greets Peace Body on Anniversary

PM3004140191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 91 Second Edition p 1

[M.S. Gorbachev undated message to Soviet Peace Foundation on anniversary]

[Text] To the Soviet Peace Foundation.

I cordially congratulate the Soviet Peace Foundation and its aktiv on a significant date in the history of the peace-making movement—the 30th anniversary of the creation of our country's oldest public foundation.

Born in the bad old days of the cold war on an initiative from below, it has now become a mass public organization, in whose activities millions of Soviet people participate on a voluntary basis.

The Peace Foundation has accumulated considerable economic, moral, and organizational potential, which serves the process of perestroyka and the cause of peace and the humanization of international relations. The Peace Foundation's contribution to strengthening trust and mutual understanding among peoples has been recognized by the award of the honorary UN title "Peace Ambassador."

I am sure that the Peace Foundation's efforts will continue to be geared to supporting public diplomacy and preserving and maintaining peace and accord in our own home; and to aiding the solution of our society's very acute social and economic problems.

I wish the Peace Foundation and its participants and activists new successes in implementing the noble aims and tasks that correspond to the fundamental interests of all Soviet people, to the ideals of peace and humanity.

[Signed] USSR President M.S. Gorbachev.

13 Republic Representatives Confer in Tallinn

PM3004224191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Leonid Levitskiy: "Thirteen Meet in Tallinn"]

[Text] Tallinn—A meeting of the heads and representatives of the governments of 13 republics has been held here.

A number of documents have been adopted which determine the development of horizontal economic ties and the kind of relations between the republics which would be determined by mutual interest rather than command from the center.

In the opinion of Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar, the discussion of the problems largely took the same direction as when the heads of nine republics discussed them with the USSR president.

USSR People's Deputy A. Sobchak, chairman of Leningrad City Soviet, said:

"We have taken the first practical steps toward creating a new Union of sovereign states. We have switched from talk to real action."

Sobchak Hails Meeting Results

LD2704095491 Moscow TASS in English 0934 GMT 27 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn April 27 TASS—The Tallinn meeting of republican government leaders is a step towards a new union of sovereign states, designed to reshape the Soviet Union, according to Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak.

Speaking to reporters after the meeting held at the initiative of the Estonian Government, Sobchak compared consultations in Tallinn with the Helsinki process.

The results of the two-day forum showed that various Soviet republics were keen to forge direct contacts, surpassing central authorities.

The meeting was attended by delegations from most Soviet republics, except elorussia, Azerbaijan and Turkmenia.

The sides signed joint documents on economic cooperation, currency regulation and joint deliveries. Participants also discussed republics' shares in the Soviet foreign debt servicing.

Economic cooperation was discussed at the meeting without any relation to politics, according to participants who said it was open to those who wanted to preserve the union and for republics willing to restore their independence.

Pavlov, Prokofyev Cited on State of USSR

PM0105143791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed feature: "May Day 1991—We Live in Hope"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted]

Valentin Pavlov, USSR Prime Minister: We Are Obliged To Do All We Can

The situation is such that even on the day of the holiday, alas, we have to talk about the extremely difficult situation in the country. The social tension factor has shot up to a high level.

As is known, the Cabinet of Ministers recently presented the USSR Supreme Soviet with a program of actions to lead the economy out of the crisis. But any program, however wonderful it may be, cannot be implemented by any government if it does not obtain broad support from public forces. We are counting on this support, but we must also take into consideration that these forces are regrouping in the country. Therefore we are gearing ourselves to the increasing role and significance of trade unions, voluntary associations at enterprises in various sectors of the national economy, creative unions, and other progressive sociopolitical movements.

However, I state bluntly that the Cabinet of Ministers does not intend to play the game of seeking popularity and recognition, we are firm in our resolve to implement the outlined measures, although many of them appear to be extremely harsh. The government is ready for dialogue, it is open to cooperation and a search for compromise decisions with the broadest public circles.

The most important thing now is efficient work and the high degree of responsibility of each citizen. We are obliged to do all we can so that factories, plants, blast furnaces, mines, power stations, and transportation work at full capacity, and so that people have incentives to work and faith in the future. [passage omitted]

Yuriy Prokofyev, Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and First Secretary of the Moscow Party Gorkom: ...So That It Does Not Remain Only on Paper

The tragic nature of the current situation as regards the future of our state is obvious. A great deal has already been said about this, and I will not provide unnecessary information. To be honest, my mood is not festive.

My own assessments of the state of affairs and of the way the city party committee [gorkom] is assessing the present time, are known, we exchanged opinions on this subject at the Moscow Party Gorkom plenum literally a few days ago.

Unfortunately, many mistakes have been made in recent years, and they have led us into an impasse. The essence of the transformations has been undermined. The means—the market economy mechanism—has turned into a political end in itself. It is the cause of the destruction of the national economy, which has led to a sharp reduction in the people's standard of living. The number of victims of interethnic conflicts is rising, and the basic sectors of industry, the defense complex, agriculture, the Army, and the state security system are being jeopardized.

All this cannot fail to provoke protest on the part of Communists. The party, which started perestroyka and was supported by the people, did not aim for these things. We must find the courage to admit that society has found itself on the road to catastrophe. Urgent measures to stabilize it, including emergency measures, are simply vital today in order to stop it from sliding into the abyss and, after reflection, continue the reforms.

We must act energetically in order to lead the country out of the crisis. The Moscow Communists have their own view of the ways out.

Stabilizing all aspects of life in order to save the reforms within the framework of perestroyka that have been started. Perhaps that is how you can briefly expound the essence of the proposals made by our party organization. They were published at the end of March in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and were sent for examination to the Central Committee Secretariat.

Therefore, on the whole, we support the "Joint Statement on Urgent Measures To Stabilize the Situation and Overcome the Crisis" signed by the USSR president and the leaders of the supreme state organs of a number of Union republics. In many ways it coincides with our position. The outlined measures just need to be made more specific and resolved all together. And the main thing is to prevent all this from merely remaining on paper again, which has happened in the past, and to prevent even the slightest thing from being unresolved.

It looks as though the most complex thing now is to overcome the excess of emotions and put ourselves into a constructive businesslike frame of mind in this difficult and most complex situation.

Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, chairman of the Liberal Democratic Party of the Soviet Union: How To Get Out of the Crisis

The misfortune of our country is that all the crises have occurred simultaneously: ideological, political, economic, and national crises. Religious freedom may turn into a religious war. The moral crisis is also the crisis of a generation.

Everything happening at once this spring exacerbated things to the utmost degree. How can we get out of this multi-tier crisis?

To my mind, there are seven possible options, and I will name just a few. These are the return to the old system, which is only supported by the United Front of Working People and the Russian Communist Party at the moment. There is Gorbachev's plan, but, as we can see, it is faltering today. The "Democratic Russia" movement is proposing the East European option, but it can be implemented only in a small republic with a dense population. In our country this would spill over into civil war and lead to the destruction of the state. There are other options including establishing Russian fascism, which would shatter everything: both sovereignties, and democrats.... And there are already the preconditions for it, and the first steps have even been taken.

Our option, the liberal option, to transfer boldly to the European model of society: a free economy, human rights as a priority, a civil society.

Today we must first and foremost resolve the national question, renounce national-territorial division, and introduce provinces with governors in charge. We need a tough centralized authority. Otherwise no reforms will work. There should be one state and one president from the political, legislative, and military point of view. But without centralizing the economy.

In our country organizations that have the destruction of the state as their main aim are permissible. This is ridiculous and does not exist anywhere else. Meeting somewhere in the Moscow City Soviet, they brand the state criminal. Can you consolidate with such people? Of course not! An alliance with patriotic forces and with some of the communists is needed today.

What we need is a transition to a two-party system. We need a new Russian president. If this is Yeltsin, the confrontation with the central power and the crisis will continue. As a candidate for the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] presidency, I promise that if I am elected, I will put a swift end to this confrontation, adopt an anticrisis program, and clamp down hard on sabotage using all possible measures. Democracy means not only permission but also prohibition.

We must immediately end the destruction of the Army. This is the last, only healthy force we have left. It can stop the destruction of the state, because the political forces will not reach a compromise. In the election campaign I am counting on Russian forces, patriots, and the Army. We are supported by many other peoples in the country. [passage omitted]

'Statement of Ten' Analyzed

PM0105130591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 91 p 2

[Article by Vasiliy Selyunin: "Will Yeltsin Be Among the Ten?"]

[Text] The "statement of the ten" has given rise to many hopes and disputes. For the second time in the past year a real prerequisite has arisen in our country for emerging from the confrontation between the center and the republics. And we have already written about this in our editorial commentaries and familiarized people with the position of the leaders of the Union republics. But there is also a different view of the "statement of the ten" whereby people do now waive their principles or embark on compromises—within the framework of a broad discussion it is all the more important to familiarize ourselves with this view too in order to become certain of our own opinion.

A case of total consensus that is rare in our stern times: The joint statement on urgent measures to stabilize the situation in the country and overcome the crisis signed by the USSR president and the leaders of nine republics was met with delight from the right, the left, above, and below, and from other directions too. Consequently we can if we want to.... But before exchanging kisses irrespective of sex or age, let's nonetheless ascertain the soil on which the cordial agreement occurred.

Politics is the art of compromise, there is nothing bad in that. And if the confrontation between the center and the republics has been resolved by mutual concessions, if the signatures of the eternal adversaries Gorbachev and Yeltsin are put to the same document, why not celebrate the event. But what were the sides' concessions?

In the statement the Union republics are called sovereign states, while the center used to be malicious about the parade of sovereignties. Then a "fundamental increase in the role of the union republics" is promised. Just their role? But in what show? Who will compose the play? Will the result not be that the republics will only play the roles of sovereign states? The formulations are deliberately vague. Just try to check later whether the role of the republics has been increased fundamentally or not.

Another concession by the center is more substantial: In the very near future to draft and sign a Union treaty and six months later to adopt a new Constitution of the Union and after that to hold elections of the union organs of power. Here the sovereign leadership is sacrificing itself. But let's take a look at the procedures for the changeover of power. It turns out that the treaty of sovereign states will be concluded "with a consideration for the results of the Union referendum which has been held." But what kind of a referendum that was and how the center interprets its results we know full well: The Soviet people did of course express themselves in favor of retaining a single state and no one is allowed to disregard their will. Even if you suppose that the top leaders of the nine republics sign a treaty of this nature will the parliaments of the sovereign states approve it? The parliament of the Ukraine, for instance? One of two things: Either, in the process of signing, one republic after another will defect from the nine, or the draft will continue to be made more detailed and continue to be coordinated through the end of the century.

But let us suppose that this barrier has by some miracle been overcome. Next is the Constitution of the Union. The statement said that it must be adopted by a Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Aggressively obedient, even earlier it was blocking urgent changes, and now it will have to vote for a decision which would mean its premature self-dissolution. Here you want to exclaim like Stanislavskiy and Nemirovich-Danchenko: I don't believe it! The deputies will submit amendments until they die of old age.

More briefly, the procedure for the changeover of power is arranged so that the present union leadership is not threatened by retirement. On the contrary, its power is now legitimized by the signatures of the leaders of the nine. After all, "the normal activity of the Union organs of power must be ensured for the entire transitional period..." yet any period is transitional in some way and in our case it will certainly never end except with a universal transition from this world to the next.

Those taking part in the meeting confirmed the commitments of the Union organs and republics with regard to the budgets and nonbudget funds. The Union organs's name is taken in vain in the statement—they do not and indeed should not bear any responsibility for the republics' coffers since it can only be a case of the republics' responsibility to the center. The situation is indeed alarming: In the first quarter instead of 55 billion rubles [R] only R21 billion entered the union budget and only a purely symbolic sum was collected for the nonbudget stabilization fund. Matters are not much better with regard to the receipt of revenue in the republics. That, of course, is a financial catastrophe. Well, since there is no revenue, you must reduce expenditure. But as we can see the republics must now cut back but you must give the Union treasury its due and not be found wanting.

And now let's do a few sums. Over half the planned Union budget revenue is intended to finance defense. With a consideration for the amendment of the Soviet of the Union planning and budget commission, monthly expenditure on this item will be nearly R11 billion, while all receipts into the Union budget so far do not exceed an average of R7 billion a month. That means that if all remaining expenditure were to cease, there would not even be enough revenue for defense. V. Pavlov's cabinet has found a solution original enough to make you weep: For April through December defense has been allocated a further R25 billion to compensate for the increased cost of military orders after the recent increase in prices. The country may collapse, that is its own business, but the defense sectors must not suffer. Incidentally, in a newspaper interview Finance Minister V. Orlov included this increment... where do you think? In the fund to compensate the population who have suffered from the price reform.

You ask where the government will find the money when the coffers are empty? That is very simple: It has the printing press in its hands. In issuing crisp bank notes to workers of the military-industrial complex the government is spreading depressant [nepodemnyye] expenditures to the entire mass of money circulating in the national economy. Defense is financed at the expense of a general reduction in the ruble's purchasing power.

Why is this being done, for heaven's sake! The hungry, worn out population is putting its final efforts into the production of tanks, missiles, and fighters and recently it has also had to spend money on destroying them under international agreements. We have already built an economy in which a fish costs more than an armed serviceman, but we still cannot calm down.

There should be no illusions. The financial agreement of the 10 leaders in practice means just one thing: The people of the nine republics should no longer refuse to pay the mounting military tax. That is nothing new, of course, but a curious subtlety has appeared: The entire levy must now be paid by nine republics, and not 15, as before. You cannot help envying the runaway republics. It is true that they were followed by threatening statesmen saying: Since that is so you will not have most-favored nation status within the framework of a single economic space. That's really frightening them! They are only too familiar with the delights of this status zone.

The statement then says: "The further intensification and development of economic ties between enterprises, regions, and republics should be ensured and the responsibility for this of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the Union republics' governments has been increased." Well, let us assume that the cabinet's hand does not extend to ties between enterprises and regions within the republics, its concern is interrepublican deliveries. When the ruble became a worthless piece of paper there were few people eager to sell goods for money and the president of the Union began in isolation to issue one decree after another on maintaining ties and threatened to punish those who disobeyed. No one fulfilled these manifestos or even apparently read them. Now responsibility for interrepublican deliveries has been assumed by the leaders of the republics. Will matters be more cheerful? I do not think so. After all, the goods producers did not have and do not have any interest in meeting deliveries. But the pressure will be tougher—by the force of 10 presidents. The first leaders of the republics lent Gorbachev their authority for an obviously hopeless undertaking: restoring command relations.

Russia is suffering most of all. It is selling the other republics its oil at 30 wooden rubles per tonne while the price on the world market is R120. The picture is the same for coal, gas, and timber. By putting his signature to the Statement Yeltsin, if we are to call things by their name, has sanctioned the further plunder of the republic's natural resources and has himself undertaken to lead these commendable measures. I fear that he will get his just desserts.

There is no denying that interrepublican ties are needed. So let's trade normally and create a common market. A market and not the above-mentioned zone in which each republic considers itself hard done by. A common economic space and sovereign republics—that is how it should be.

The country's major economists have completely rejected the anticrisis program announced by the Union government. But the leaders of the nine republics accept it together with strong-arm methods of execution. Above all "the participants in the meeting expressed themselves in favor of introducing a special work regime in the base sectors of industry, at enterprises producing consumer goods, and in rail transport." That means at the least a ban on strikes. In due form war has been declared on democrats and clandestine destructive elements: "...the leaders of the Union and the republics regard as intolerable attempts to achieve political goals through incitement to civil disobedience and to strikes and calls to overthrow the existing legally elected organs of state power." Resolute actions by the law enforcement organs over a wide space are envisaged.

As a first trial of the new course the miners have been asked to end their strikes and to make efforts to make up what has been lost. During the strike I had the great fortune to work for the miners. It is a base lie that they wanted to extract benefits for themselves to the detriment of others. The strikes struggled for the common weal, for the country's future. They demanded the resignation of the Union authorities only because the present center is concerned solely with retaining a renewed bureaucratic system and socialist values mysterious to the people. The miners created a committee which has been keeping the economy afloat. If the threat of a production stoppage arose somewhere, teams to unload coal went there.

It is appropriate to note that the "so-called" democrats in their majority treated the outbreak of workers' activity with splendid indifference. They have their own concerns: organizing a "roundtable" with Gorbachev's team and carrying ministerial portfolios. Who will give them to you, my good men? When the members of the Polish informal organizations at down at a similar roundtable a formidable force stood behind them—10 million "Solidarity" members. But who stands behind you, Messrs democrats? You have contrived to refuse point-blank to see the workers movement, whose equal in strength there has not yet been in Soviet history. It is painful to say this, but the truth must be spoken.

By the Way

Boris Yeltsin said that "for the first time the president has behaved in a human way and retreated from many of his former views." The meeting lasted nine and one-half hours. During the meeting, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet chairman said, 80 percent of the draft Joint Statement was reworked.

Boris Yeltsin assured the people's deputies that "there no deviation by a single step from Russian principles."

He said that the president had acknowledged the republics' right to form a union of sovereign states and also recognized the right to political sovereignty for all republics which do not intend to conclude a Union Treaty.

About currency. Yeltsin said that the president promised that the republics would themselves dispose of the currency they have earned. They are guaranteed general licensing for the export of their output.

CPSU Should Compromise With Other Parties

PM3004114491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Yu. Vasyutin and Doctor of Historical Sciences Z. Zotova as part of "Discussion Sheet" page: "Confrontation or Compromise"]

[Text] Moscow—The opposition between political forces in the country has reached danger point. Further confrontation could prove fatal to our fatherland.

It has already fallen to its lot, in the 20th century, to suffer unprecedented trials and upheavals: three revolutions, four major wars. Can the people bear another? No one is likely to answer that question in the affirmative. The consequences could be catastrophic.

This does not worry certain political leaders, and does not stop them. In the struggle for power, they call increasingly persistently for strikes, which even without their help are tearing the country apart, and for civil disobedience. And in these conditions the attainment of political stability becomes an essential condition of the survival of the people and the state.

The leading role in resolving this task must belong to the CPSU, which must by every possible means seek civil consensus and clearly define its relationship with other political parties. And that requires a timely assessment of the distribution of political forces in the country. It is essential to know the size, social composition, and spheres of influence of the main parties and to discover opportunities for interaction—and it is well known that there are two sides to interaction: either struggle or cooperation. And this is determined by the very nature of the parties themselves, their ideology, program, and tactics.

Thus on the extreme right wing of political life we find the "Democratic Russia" bloc, which unites some 30 parties and organizations, and which considers itself "left-wing." As we can see, it openly opposes the CPSU, calls for the resignation of the Union Government, and considers the Union treaty unacceptable. And no one is any longer perturbed to find today among the fiercest anticommunists some former "partocrats" who only recently held fairly high posts. Even now they are hungry

for power, riding on the wave of rallies and strikes. In this atmosphere it is, of course, difficult to talk about consolidation. But when it is a matter of life and death, of the country's fate, common sense must prevail.

It would do all of us no harm today to look at the pages of our own history. At one time Lenin's party accumulated considerable experience of interaction with other parties and organizations. And not all of it was, so to speak, black and hopeless. At various stages of the revolution there were changes in the content and emphasis of alliances and agreements, and various different questions came to the fore, depending on the situation. But it should be noted that at that period the parties were, for the most part, sincere and honorable. Their aims were precisely what they proclaimed them to be. Today, unfortunately, we often encounter the practice of substituting one concept for another, so that sometimes even the name of a party does not properly reflect its aims and means of achieving them. We see that many parties that proclaimed themselves to be democratic are in practice tending toward ultraliberalism. While publicly campaigning for the working people's interests and exploiting for their own purposes the genuinely acute problems of miners and workers at industrial enterprises, these democrats shamelessly call themselves the "party of entrepreneurs."

A good many people are deluded into joining such movements. Of course, their own political experience will be of the greatest importance to them, but painstaking, persuasive educational work by Communists is also needed. And it is this work that is, alas, sometimes in an indifferent state in our party organizations.

Nor can it be ignored that a section of the population that has lost confidence in the CPSU has risen to the banners of other political parties. And it is not only the mistakes and crisis phenomena of recent years that are to blame for this. It is also the consequence of poor work by Communists with young people and with the scientific, technical, and creative intelligentsia, which was unable to fulfill itself in the years of stagnation.

You may object: This is just another appeal for eclecticism. What about principles, which we are not supposed to "waive"? But it is no bad thing to remember that from the very first steps in its historical activity Lenin's party, despite ideological differences with other currents, was prepared to pool efforts to achieve specific goals. For instance, in the struggle against the autocracy. The revolutionary social democrats' compromises with the "legal Marxists" are well known. Prior to the liberals' formation of an autonomous party, the social democrats also tried repeatedly to "awaken" them, hoping, as V.I. Lenin put it, that "the activity of liberals and social democrats would be complementary." True, the logic of subsequent political development in Russia led to the separation of the political forces that had grouped themselves around social democracy. Practical political activity itself made each current emphasize the demands of those strata whose interests it represented. But Lenin constantly focused attention on developing the proletariat's class self-awareness, cultivating its ability to comprehend the various political forces generated by the social movement, and unleashing the potential to form blocs and conclude separate agreements with them on specific issues. Thus the Bolsheviks formed a bloc with the SR's [Social Revolutionaries] in the first Russian revolution, believing that their activity would promote the development and deepening of the revolutionary process in the country, and moved toward an alliance with the internationalists on the eve of October. They joined with the cadets in submitting questions to the government in the State Duma [Council]. Remember, finally, the coalition with the "left SR's."

Today too, it is important for Communists to consider the possibility of alliances and agreements with other parties. Despite the fact that many of them are in opposition to the CPSU, there are undoubtedly points of contact. Take, for instance, the centrist bloc, which unites some 20 parties and movements. Here we see the Liberal Democratic Party, the A.D. Sakharov Union of Democratic Forces, the Russian People's Front, the Russian Democratic Party, the People's Constitutional Party, and a number of others. The Communists have major differences of opinion with them. However, this bloc puts forward a number of measures that are in the people's interests. These include the endeavor to find peaceful, nonviolent ways out of the crisis, the struggle against extremism, the preservation of a democratic union state, and the creation of a rule-of-law state.

The "Left Democracy" bloc is closer to the CPSU than others. It unites the Socialist Party, syndicalist organizations, some of the supporters of the Marxist platform in the CPSU (the nonorthodox Marxists) and the Democratic Platform, left-wing social democrats, and representatives of "Memorial." It also includes the committees for assistance to the workers' movement and the labor confederation. The essence of their platform is the consistent democratization of society, the strengthening of local power and production self-management, and the transformation of every working person, including engineers and managers (as opposed to "entrepreneurs"), into a co-owner, a comanager. The main point in common with this bloc is the attitude toward socialism and the interpretation of it. It would appear that not only individual joint actions, but also interparty cooperation is possible with the "Left Democrats."

Let us also recall that the basis of the Leninists' compromise with the left-wing SR's was the resolution of the land question through the implementation of the SR idea of socialization of the land, that is, sharing out the land on a leveling basis. The allies thereby enlisted the support of broad masses of the working peasantry. (The tragic split between these parties in the summer of 1918 is a separate issue, and is a terrible lesson that only goes to confirm the vital necessity for compromise and consensus).

But why look so far back? Did not the question of consolidation arise in the first years of perestroyka? After all, as long ago as the 28th CPSU Congress there was talk of bringing into the government various political parties and movements that recognize the socialist choice and advocate human rights. Of a government of social consensus, based on the people's confidence.

True, the situation has recently deteriorated markedly. Does the present moment offer a chance of consolidation? Judging by certain public actions and statements by the ultraradical press, any compromise could appear impossible. All the same, we are confident that common sense should prevail over political ambition.

How could it be otherwise? Whenever danger has threatened the country, our people have found the strength to rally and stand firm. Now that we face a real, not hypothetical, threat of the collapse of our statehood, all social forces and movements must rise above political differences and pool their efforts for the sake of saving our suffering Motherland.

Calls for cooperation and interaction should be heard, because, in the words of the poet, "the worthy citizen cannot turn a cold heart to the homeland." It seems that the seeds of a sense of responsibility are already producing their first shoots. And evidence of this is provided even by the recent extraordinary Russian congress. After beginning work in an atmosphere of fierce confrontation, it reached agreement and adopted the necessary decisions.

The Union's Federation Council, in turn, having drawn up an anticrisis program, called for strife to be set aside and for all healthy forces to unite and set about concrete practical action. The unification of all democratic forces that adhere in practice, not merely in words, to patriotic positions was also discussed at the April joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission.

To sum up, we can say: In all situations compromise is possible, all that is needed is the good will of the opposing sides. And, of course, purposeful efforts by the CPSU—the country's biggest political force.

TASS Reviews Press for 1 May

LD0105080191 Moscow TASS in English 0646 GMT 1 May 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 1 TASS—Today's newspapers run banners marking international workers' day.

President Mikhail Gorbachev presented awards to workers, scientists, farmers and artists at a ceremony in the Kremlin, newspapers report.

Newspapers write about a devastating earthquake in Georgia. They carry President Mikhail Gorbachev's condolences to the Georgian people.

PRAVDA conducted an opinion poll about a "joint statement on urgent measures to stabilise the situation in the country and overcome the crisis," signed by Gorbachev and leaders of nine Soviet republics.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA interviews Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, writer Yuriy Bondarev, Metropolitan Pitirim, Communist Party Politburo member Yuriy Prokofiyev and other political and public figures on ways to settle the Soviet crisis.

Politburo member Galina Semenova comments in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA on social issues.

Every third Soviet child lives below the poverty line, birth rates are falling, Semenova said, calling for urgent measures to protect the mother and child socially.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries an ardent article by Soviet parliament leader Svetlana Goryacheva against blind faith in political figures.

The newspaper devotes a page to readers' letters.

TRUD comments on recent labour unrest in Belorussia. It also carries a story about Kuzbass miners.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes about the search for Yettiy in the Soviet Union.

PRAVDA carries an interview with Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov in which he speaks about his visit to Belgium.

The newspaper writes about the situation in the Middle East, a roundtable discussion between key political parties in Ulster, and a telephone conversation between President Mikhail Gorbachev and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA covers developments in northern Iraq, where the allied forces are creating a safety zone for Kurds.

Economic

77 Kuzbass Mines Remain on Strike

AU3004211591 Paris AFP in English 2043 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, April 30 (AFP)—Russian leader Boris Yeltsin was warmly welcomed Tuesday on a second day of his tour of the Siberian Kuzbass coalfields, scene of an eight-week-old miners' strike, reports said.

Mr. Yeltsin held talks in Novokuznetsk with miners' leaders, who have called for the resignation of both the federal government and of President Mikhail Gorbachev.

A regional strike committee representative Aleksandr Smirnov told INTERFAX news agency that 77 companies were still on strike Tuesday in the Kuzbass basin, where the dispute first started.

TASS news agency reported Monday that some 40 coal enterprises remained on strike.

Ukraine Coal Miners Returning to Work

LD3004181591 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] The situation remains unstable at the coal mines of the Ukraine. Representative of the governmental committee in Kiev, (Voldymyr Gulyayev), reported that today 37 mines were on strike. However, many strikers revised their attitude toward the strike. For four days now the miners of Krasnoarmeysk have been working. In Donetsk the miners of one of the mines got down to work. In Makeyevka three mines resumed work, and in Chervonograd, Lvov region, six mines began to extract coal.

Strike Situation Viewed

LD3004213291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Apr 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Now about the topic has been worrying us most of all in recent days and weeks. The strike wave is on the ebb. The country's industry, which was choking under the pressure of an acute coal shortage, can now breathe a sigh of relief.

[Correspondent G. Kondaurov] The largest mine in the Ukraine, named after I. Stakhanov, which was on strike for almost two months, has started to produce coal. Labor collectives of all mines of the Krasnoarmeyskugol industrial association have by majority vote adopted a decision to suspend the strike. This was facilitated by an agreement on fulfilling the demands of the strikers, which was signed by deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet and representatives of the government and miners after protracted talks.

At the Stakhanov mine the average salary of those working underground was 420 rubles before the strike. In May it will already be 570 rubles, excluding the compensation in connection with price rises. At the beginning of next year it will go up to 1,600 rubles. For this, the settlement price for coal will have to be increased.

To date the mine's losses resulting from the strike amount to 400,000 tonnes of fuel and 40 million rubles. The continuation of the strike would have led to a financial crash not only for the mines of the Krasnoarmeyskugol association, but also for the town and settlements where the miners live.

A number of mines, however, continue the strike in Donbass. The Donetsk strike committee says there are 31 of them. According to the state committee for coal, many mines are partially resuming their work. In miners' collectives in Donbass, opinions on the need to stop the two-month old strike prevail, as it was the mines that first found themselves in a sad plight; the view is that the fulfilment of their demand should be attained by other methods.

[Announcer] We would like to add the latest information to the report. To date in the oblast—mainly in Donetsk and Makeyevka - only 15 out of 120 pits are not shipping either partial or full loads of coal. The collectives of the remaining mines are working normally.

Belorussian Miners Return to Work

LD2904202691 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 0300 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Text] After a strike which has lasted for more than a week, the miners and concentration workers of the Beloruskaliy production amalgamation in Soligorsk have gone back to work. The strike committee decided to suspend the strike even though out of the strikers' 19 demands only two have been satisfied: the wages of the amalgamation workers have been doubled and the members of the strike committee have been temporarily relieved from work with their pay preserved so that they can try to get the rest of the miners' demands satisfied.

Our correspondent adds that over the period of the strike, the Beloruskaliy amalgamation lost about 15 million rubles worth of expected profits. This will considerably affect the enterprise's financial situation, the buying of equipment, and the implementation of the housing program first of all.

Anticrisis Program Termed 'Political Maneuver'

914A0675A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 91 p 1

[Article by Academician N. Petrakov, Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Bim, Doctor of Economic Sciences Yu. Borozdin, and Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Perlamutrov: "Reforms Are Expensive. We Cannot Afford Them"; first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] *The government's anticrisis program was ratified by the Union legislature. But work on it is continuing. Discussion is also continuing. The Institute of Problems of the Market of the USSR Academy of Sciences conducted an independent analysis of the document. Those who participated in its work were: Academician N. Petrakov, Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Bim, Doctor of Economic Sciences Yu. Borozdin, and Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Perlamutrov. We publish their concise conclusions.*

In a difficult sociopolitical and economic situation, why are legislators, scientists, and the public once again engaged in a discussion of new government plans?

It is obvious that the economic situation requires that the president and the Cabinet of Ministers significantly radicalize the policy they are conducting. The center has sensed that its economic policy is becoming less and less

popular. After proclaiming the need to form a centrist bloc, the leadership is trying to represent the economic program as a basis for political cooperation.

However, professional analysis shows that the new program is nothing but a political maneuver, summoned to demonstrate to the country and the world the availability of large-scale anticrisis measures in the government's arsenal, and at the same time to "sanctify" a future tough policy of the present cabinet with the help of public discussions and parliamentary decisions.

A sharp dissonance is apparent between statements made for effect on "stabilizing and market" intentions and the scale of clarity of the proposed systems of centralized administrative measures. It is precisely the latter measures, in fact, that are the cabinet's basic program.

It is significant that the economic program does not contain any qualitative assessments. There is an absence of calculations of the scales and rates of inflation, disproportions in money turnover, the budget deficit, and foreign indebtedness.

Speaking of the "emergency budget" in general, the authors of the program leave unanswered precisely what expenditures and precisely what budgets it is proposed to cut. Today, it is already obvious that without a sharp reduction in production investments, subsidies to the agrarian sector, assistance to other countries, and especially expenditures on defense, neither structural perestroyka nor anti-inflationary measures are possible. It is not clear from the program whether this is apparent to the government.

It would seem that the cabinet is especially concerned about preventing a further drop in production. However, the program does not have any kind of data on planned resource tactics. There are no satisfactory answers to the question of how to expand export potential and to liquidate the foreign debt, although restricting imports has an extremely negative effect on the viability of many industries and the imbalance in the consumer market.

It is incomprehensible how the urge to reduce imports conforms to anti-inflationary measures—in any case, for these purposes imports of consumer goods should, on the contrary, be increased.

In general, will it be possible to halt inflation, or at least to control it? One is put on guard by the fact that the liberalization of prices and the freeing of income was addressed only after control was virtually lost over both prices and income. What will be done so that price liberalization matches anticipated demonopolization—otherwise, how is a galloping increase in prices to be avoided?! The planned indexation of incomes (to the extent of an increase in cost of living) does not resolve problems and, as world experience shows, leads only to a further acceleration of the inflationary "prices-income" spiral.

However paradoxical it is, there is no assurance: Will not the anti-inflationary programs of the present government aggravate inflation?

One of the main questions of the current reform is about the role and functions of the state under the conditions of the formation of a market. According to the government's scheme—and this becomes very apparent from the program—the state remains the main subject of the economic life of society, determining all and everything in it. The rule of the market is practically not permitted even in such a purely market sphere as the formation of production relations between enterprises. It is well-known that the direct interference of administrative organs in the process of production and exchange and the large-scale introduction of various kinds of "special regimes for the functioning of branches and enterprises" are attributes of a state of the previous type. The state is the absolute owner, a super monopolist that historically has proved its economic incompetence.

A number of provisions of the program in the area of privatization deserve support. But, unfortunately, here too an integral and complete system of practical measures is lacking. It is incomprehensible why denationalization and privatization should develop "based mainly on the existing departmental affiliation of enterprises." Such an orientation only complicates and delays privatization, and will promote the conservation of old economic relations and their camouflage under new "roofs"—state concerns and so forth. This practice, as is known, has already received wide application. What especially puts one on guard is the retention in the cabinet structure of a large number of industrial ministries and the crude substitution of signboards on some of the general economic departments (Gosplan [State Plan]—Ministry of Economics and Forecasting, Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply]—Ministry of Material Resources). In the process, it is planned to sever from governmental status practically all of the regulating structures of a market type economy that are being created.

The concluding part of the document enumerates the political conditions under which the cabinet is responsible for the implementation of its own program. The question concerns a moratorium on political strikes, the cessation of the "war of laws," and the compulsory nature of decisions of "higher organs for lower organs."

What is the result? The cabinet, in fact, is not prepared to work under real conditions that are caused primarily by the unsatisfactory policy of the government regarding the logical reformation of the economy and the prevention of a crisis. It demands: Create a comfortable political situation for us, and then we will assume responsibility for the restoration of production. (Moreover, almost by semi-military methods—right up to the use of the army in the agrarian sector). At a time when, in fact, the problem is entirely different: Implement effective anti-crisis measures, carry out market reforms, and, on this basis, the sociopolitical situation will also stabilize.

Thus, the program is adopted. But how will the republics, the regions, and social movements react to it? The program, directed at tough measures, is obviously "slanted" toward centralism, and it even envisages sanctions against "disobedient" republics (although it is not clear how these sanctions are to be implemented). In addition, a number of republics now have their own programs (Russia, Kazakhstan).

It is true that reassuring aspects have appeared. There is a joint statement by the USSR president and the higher leadership of a number of republics. A productive path, it seems, consists of forming a new Union from republics that seek union or that agree to a union. This will be a very difficult, but not hopeless. It is also time to admit unequivocally: A number of republics (Lithuania, Georgia, and, possibly, some others) have to be left in peace, concentrating attention not on dragging them into the Union (this is now impossible), but on the more complicated problems of arranging normal and civilized cooperation on a new basis. Then sanctions will not have to be applied.

Economic Consequences of Union Split Viewed

914A0660A Moscow TRUD in Russian 23 Apr 91 p 2

[Article by Yu. Sharipov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Committee on Economic Relations of the Republics and Autonomous Formations, and Yu. Skorokhodov, deputy departmental chief of the USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat: "Reflections at the Threshold—Can We Guarantee a Worthy Life 'After Scattering to National Apartments?'"]

[Text] Our state today, figuratively speaking, is getting to look more and more like a large unsteady house whose tenants are trying to jump out of it as fast as possible, after having done nothing to reinforce the walls and the structure. What awaits them on the other side of the threshold?

In the dust of political battles, which led to brutal conflict situations and human sacrifices in a number of regions of the country, ideologues of a final disintegration of our common home, recognized by the whole world community as the USSR, are persistently trying to pass off what is desired as reality. But reality is increasingly taking on a dramatic coloration.

Instead of cooperation, confrontation of state organs and political movements and groups is occurring. A state of crisis has developed in the observance of legislation and social norms and rules. The principle of collateral subordination of organs of authority and administration is being violated. The vagueness of the attitude of Union authority toward the sovereignties being proclaimed by the republics and toward decisions on the supremacy of legislation of various levels, threatens the existence of the country as a single whole in the world community.

The political instability is being aggravated by the crisis in the socioeconomic sphere. A breakdown is going on in administrative ties. Narrow group and egoistic interests of producers are exulting. The financial-monetary system and the consumer market are in complete disarray. A drop in production is continuing in all branches of the national economy. The situation is being aggravated by the growing strike movement.

It is difficult to resign oneself to the fact that there are shortages of many vitally necessary products in such a superpower as the USSR, and that norms are being set for their distribution. Ministries and departments, and also in a number of cases their successors—various kinds of associations and concerns—have rushed, under conditions of strict cost accounting relations, to find an easy life at the expense of the export of products intended for the domestic market. Enterprises are behaving approximately the same way, referring to their right to independently dispose of finished products for self-financing.

The structure of production, which was formed over the decades, and in which the mining branch and heavy industries prevail, came into conflict with the requirements of the individual. The economy more and more began to distance itself from the vital needs of the population.

As previously, the restraining factor in its development remained the expenditures on the military-industrial complex, whose technical capabilities were utilized for civilian needs on an extremely small scale in comparison with states that were advanced in a military sense.

The question comes up: How do we stop the country's slide into chaos, which is leading to a disintegration of the state? A resolution of this problem is impossible without reforming industrial relations, up to and including their fundamental principles, and, most of all, the attitude toward property. Unfortunately, in many republics and regions, in our opinion, an aspiration prevails to divide property quickly, but not to create a mechanism for uniting efforts in its rational use under market conditions. We simply have stopped coping with objective reality. But it is obvious: The Union republics have close economic ties, and there is no getting away from this.

It is enough to cite one indicator: The level of interrepublic exchange in gross national product of the country as a whole. In the USSR, it is 20.5 percent. At the same time, there is a rather substantial difference between republics in the volumes of import and export of products in relation to the volumes of output and consumption. For example, in republic consumption, the import indices vary from 15 percent in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] to 31 percent in Armenia, but export indices (in republic output) vary from 12 percent in the RSFSR to 27 percent in the Transcaucasus and Belorussian republics.

The conclusion from this: The smaller the volume of production activity of a republic, the more it finds itself dependent on the level of economic ties with other

regions. But this means: Without the preservation of the existing Union market, it will be practically impossible to guarantee the vital activity of a majority of the republics.

Similar conclusions also suggest themselves in the analysis of foreign economic activity. Under current conditions, the import of products for the needs of all of the republics is essentially covered by hard currency earned in the RSFSR, mainly owing to the sale of oil and gas. But, actually, the RSFSR receives import products whose volume is less than that which would correspond to the hard currency earned on its territory. The entire difference is transferred to other republics, and just for the years 1986-1989, this amounted to more than 42 billion rubles [R] in domestic prices.

The great interdependence of the republics can be judged even if it is limited only to an analysis of the exchange of domestic products. More than half of the republics are exporters (first and foremost, the RSFSR, Belorussia, the Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova), and the rest, especially Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, are principally importers. This is a consequence of the specialization of production that evolved over many decades. As a result, for example, in nine republics, the export of consumer commodities prevails, with a simultaneous increase of imports of products of a production designation in seven of them (the Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, Latvia, Armenia, Estonia, and Lithuania).

Of course, some ties for a number of raw materials-extracting republics are economically unprofitable. However, it is necessary to seek ways to give these ties a more equivalent character, in the final analysis deriving specific benefits for everyone.

But, in the meantime, the increasing stream of violations in existing economic relations inexorably leads to a drop in production.

A stoppage is occurring everywhere in industrial installations that produce semifinished products and consumer goods. There were a thousand of them just in the last five years. For example, the closing of the NPO [Scientific Production Association] Nairit in Yerevan—the only producer in the country of chloroprene rubber and a number of components for medical preparations and chemical items—this had a negative effect on the work of more than 700 enterprises in other regions. Similar stoppages have led to curtailment of deliveries of raw materials for the production of medicines for a total of more than R1.2 billion. In addition, there was a curtailment in the activity of production, in fact, of the USSR Ministry of the Medical Industry, as a result of which the most necessary medicines were not provided for the population (penicillin, vitamins, and cardiovascular and antipyretic preparations) for a total sum of about R260 million.

The narrow local approach to interrepublic deliveries of commodities has become stronger. The attempt of the republics to replace vertical ties with horizontal ones by means of signing interrepublic agreements is not bringing the expected results. This is due mainly to the lack of a common mechanism for implementing the agreements.

Many violations of economic relations appeared as a result of the fact that the legislation of a number of republics determines the priority of republic state orders. The USSR Supreme Soviet passed a law "On Economic Relations in 1991," on the basis of which enterprises and organizations are authorized to use up to 20 percent of the products produced in conformity with the state order. This law stipulates that state deliveries, determined by the government of the USSR, are filled after implementation of the republic orders. The example turned out to be contagious, and many local organs of authority introduced their own additional orders for delivery by enterprises of from 10 to 30 percent of an already distributed product.

The Ukraine decides to retain practically the entire assortment of rolled ferrous metals that are in short supply, and hundreds of large enterprises and construction organizations, mainly on the territory of Russia, can end up in a difficult situation.

In our opinion, even greater unpleasantness will await each republic that attempts to conduct radical reorganizations of the economy only within the scope of its own borders. It is unlikely that there can be a change in the structure of the economy of an individual republic in a short period, inasmuch as a large one-time investment will be required for these purposes. These processes will occur even more painfully at the level of individual enterprises.

The opinion prevails in individual republics that after withdrawing from the Union it will only be painful to live through the transition period (let us suppose, five to ten years), that there will be an adaptation to the new economic conditions, and that afterward an era of well-being and sufficiency will arrive. This is an erroneous opinion, because when political separatism is "superimposed" onto economic separatism, it is impossible to rely on the maintenance and strengthening of horizontal relations of the republics. With the disintegration of the Union as a single economic expanse in economic relations between regions, it is more likely that a breakdown phase will set in, and not a transition period. In this connection, one can cite the example of the semiparalysis of the economy of Lithuania as a result of the well-known events of the spring of last year, with simultaneous large losses in other republics.

Thus, based on the provisions of the draft Union treaty, the voluntary participation of the republics in an all-Union market, in our opinion, will make it possible to bring the country out of the deep economic crisis, to stop the drop in the standard of living of the population in all regions, and to resolve one of the main tasks—overcoming significant differences among the republics in the conditions of their socioeconomic development.

The time has come for deep thought by all of those who are calling for an immediate abandonment of our home—the Union SSR—without disclosing to their people the truth about the possibility of new economic and social shocks that could lead to grave consequences in each of our lives and in the life of society as a whole.

Trade Union Official on Tension in Oil Industry

LD2904212191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1454 GMT 29 Apr 91

[From the "Mayak Panorama" program]

[Text] [Announcer] In connection with the sharply worsened social tension in the oil and gas industry and in construction, Vladimir Timofeyevich Sedenko, chairman of the central council of this industrial trade union, arranged a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists. He said, in part:

[Begin Sedenko recording] We cannot say that the president and the government are unaware of the state of affairs in our industries. Our problems have been repeatedly examined at government sessions, including some convened at the suggestion of the trade union, and decisions have been adopted. A certain amount has of course been done, but as a rule this has not concerned the resolution of our basic issues, and for that reason the state of affairs has continued to worsen. In view of this negative tendency the industrial trade union and the leaders of the industries managed to have USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev examine the whole gamut of problems which have accumulated. As a result, measures to stabilize the nation's oil and gas industries were adopted.

The executive committee of the trade union's central council has analyzed the progress in implementing this, and has established that the USSR president's instructions to draft to implement effective measures within a week to resolve the urgent issues of finance, the material-technical supply, and the supply of food and essentials are not being carried out. Meanwhile, the social tension in labor collectives has reached a critical point. That is why the third plenum of the USSR trade union of workers central council in the oil and gas industry and the construction industry was compelled on 16 April this year to review the state of affairs in the industries, the socio-economic situation of the workers of our enterprises, and the reaction of the USSR Government to the statements and appeals made previously by the trade union and the demands put forward.

It was decided to form a commission for talks with the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. The first meeting of the two commissions, ours and the government's, was held on Saturday, 27 April. We agreed to continue the joint constructive dialogue to achieve the fastest resolution to the demands put forward. The next meeting of the commission will be held on 14 May this year. [end recording]

Agricultural

Cabinet Orders Aim To Promote Spring Field Work

PM2804113591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[B. Aleksandrov article: "Concerned About Future Harvest"]

[Text] Urgently introducing a special system for supplying agriculture with material and technical resources—above all, fuels, lubricants, spares, sowing equipment, and harvesters—is the task which the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has set the USSR Ministry of Material Resources, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, and Union ministries and departments providing material and technical supplies to the countryside. They have been instructed to ensure that contracts connected with the fulfillment of orders for the countryside are concluded before 20 April this year.

The Cabinet of Ministers instruction adopted in fulfillment of the 4 April 1991 USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the State of Affairs in Agriculture and Urgent Measures to Prepare for Field Work" and the 8 April 1991 USSR presidential decree "On Urgent Measures in Agriculture" also instruct the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the USSR Ministry of Material Resources, and the USSR Ministry of Justice to elaborate measures to enhance the personal responsibility of, and beef up sanctions against, leaders and collectives at enterprises which are undermining the targets for delivering material and technical supplies to the countryside and to sectors serving the agro-industrial complex, and to enhance the responsibility of producer plants for ensuring that the equipment they produce is in working order when it comes to be used. Proposals on submitting corresponding amplifications and amendments to existing legislation should be submitted before 15 May.

The USSR Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, and the USSR Ministry of Material Resources with the participation of Union republic governments have been instructed to elaborate and submit to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers within a month proposals to boost production of small and medium-sized tractors, and to organize production of horse-drawn agricultural implements and instruments, involving local industry enterprises in republics, krays, and oblasts in such production.

Shortages, Idleness Threaten Grain Supplies

PM3004153591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 1,2

[Aleksey Klimenko report under the "Topical Theme" rubric: "Grain Time. Should Peasants Be the Only People to Have to Remember It?"]

[Text] They say that he who did not come on time was late. But to be late with sowing clearly means "preprogramming" an insufficient harvest. And this can happen. Alarm signals are coming from the southern areas of the country where work is in full swing. There is not enough equipment, materials, or fuel. The lack of discipline among the suppliers and the indifference of partners to the needs of the countryside are depressing. Only by radical and resolute measures, many letters and telegrams arriving in the editorial office today stress, is it possible to nip in the bud the complete despotism of chaos in the country and in the countryside. That is, on the busy agricultural front now unfolding.

PRAVDA correspondent V. Stepkov reports:

"At Lipetsk Oblast kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the situation at this busy time has proved to be so complex that the oblast soviet of people's deputies has introduced a state of emergency on the oblast's territory from 26 March to 1 July."

That's tough, is it? But is letting things slide, chattering about the sowing rather than getting down to it, and creating a "foundation" for hunger, more humane?

S. Stoyanov, student at the USSR Academy of the National Economy, expresses the following worry:

"What if new 'brakes' are added to the former ones in the country's grain production process. The price to be paid for the lack of coordination among those participanting in this process is too high. If everything is weighed up, there is still time to eliminate the incongruities preventing this all from slotting neatly together. There is still time to make changes to the purchasing mechanism, equipping it with the levers of real economic interests and responsibility. This involves offering a sufficient number of material and technical resources to act as incentives to the enterprises that operate as procurement centers in the grain products system. And there must be rigorous government control of the delivery of these resources for sale against [future] grain purchases. Tangible liability in terms of their assets must be prescribed for farms which fail to fulfill contracts for the sale of grain to the state—the size of the fine should be the full value of the grain not so sold. Given the exceptional importance and political significance of the "grain question," I believe that an autonomous structure (a ministry, a state committee, or even better—an association) under the direct jurisdiction of the republic government should be preserved. It would devote itself to the procurement of grain, the treatment and delivery of grain..."

As we can see, the incipient great battle for the 1991 harvest mirrors the sudden awakening to the fact that you cannot plough or sow a field simply by alluding to the "flaws of perestroyka." Nor feed the country. However there continues to be a great deal of abstract hullabaloo about the food disaster. Of course, there is a disaster, it has arrived. But where do we frequently look for its causes? "Do you want to know the real reason why the food crisis has broken out in our country," Yu. Manukhin from Krasnoyarsk asks the editorial office. "It is because we have sharply reduced the grain purchases abroad. If we return to the previous volumes of wheat imports, everything will turn out all right..."

Proposing "magic" methods of escaping all kinds of adversities—is this not a sign of a decline in the real activity of society? No, total food sufficiency can be neither "imported" nor "bought." You have to know how to attain it. And safeguard it. But what are we doing? We just frittered away millions of tonnes of last year's bumper harvest granted to us by nature itself.

We have a rare facility for "reaping" poverty even from wealth. This is perhaps the ultimate in mismanagement. And what a forgetful people we are. We are trotting out the reasons for the near failure of the fall work last year and applying them to the current spring work... Again we are more concerned with politics than work. Again we are rushing at top speed to listen to bad language of the type that is common in public squares and on banners during rally bickering. Again the opponents of peace are not failing to take advantage of the country's "olive branch" to speculate on the "grain factor." Their emissaries who have established themselves at local level in the nests of bureaucrats, who believe in the principle of "the worse it is, the better," are blocking the path of workers and employees who want to get down to agricultural work. They are throwing the "field work orchestra" into disorder because of the muddle in deliveries. Speaking from parochial positions, they are destroying the threads of interregional business contacts. They clash head-on with former partners, not even balking at fabrications and intrigues. Alarm signals about this are flooding in from Georgia, Moldova, and the Baltic republics. If we do not urgently restore order to the field work process, there will be no sharing in the all-union harvest dividend.

The Soviet Union's boundless grain lands will not feed those who forget the popular dictum: You will not get very far on a lame horse. After all, at the moment thousands of broken seed drills, plows, and cultivators are standing idle. In Karaganda Oblast, hundreds of powerful K-700 tractors that are so vital to the countryside today are "barefoot"—there is no rubber.

Once again the fuel suppliers are forcing the machine operators to look with trepidation at the empty fuel tanks when starting the battle for grain. Many kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Stavropol and Kuban that have embarked on the sowing have already been brought to a stadstill a "gasoline paralysis." Almost everywhere a very acute shortage of resources to fight pests of agricultural crops can be felt. Losses resulting from this in grain alone could be as much as 8-10 million tonnes.

The unprecedented delay in repairing grain harvesting equipment will do this harvest no favors. An abundance of places are known not to have started this task yet. "The units should start being 'healed' in winter," R. Absalyamov, a combine operator from Bashkiria notes

bitterly. "But this year we have not had any deliveries of spare parts at all. There is such a concept as retarded ignition. I am afraid that the people on whom the fate of this year's grain depends may find this concept will operate in them once again. We have become accustomed to shaking our fists after a fight."

Alas, this custom is in evidence even at the top of the administrative pyramid. Thus, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers instruction that envisages the additional allocation of material and technical resources and hard currency to speed the influx of grain into the state resources appeared... in February of this year. If the "ignition" were switched on earlier, then perhaps the cereals would not "hang about" in enormous quantities in the localities. The amount in the state granaries would not then be 17 million tonnes less than the state order.

Complacency is dangerous in that like radiation sickness it affects people and society gradually. And is that not why the gap between the outburst of our nihilistic obstinacy and the unprecedented decline in our industriousness is building up all the time? Our indignant reasoning is on the boil... But its steam most often powers the machine of empty talk and idleness. The 1991 harvest will scarcely bring us any joy if, during the period intended for busy field work, which should feed us for the rest of the year, we continue working instead at the impetuous excesses of rallies in the city's squares.

All kinds of divergent opinions may exist, but there is no such thing as "divergent sowing." There is just one kind of sowing. And here we need one victory for all. How many more times does thunder need to crash above our heads before we "cross ourselves"? Only a victory of common sense at this time on the grain fields which feed us can save us. Because a dissent at grain sowing time will lead the way to the abyss.

Politburo's Stroyev Comments on Spring Campaign

914B0140A Moscow GLASNOST in Russian No 16, 18 Apr 91 p 2

[Article by Ye.S. Stroyev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, under the rubric "Timely Commentary": "The Spring Campaign: Hope and Alarm"]

[Text] Each spring is different in its own way. But when that time arrives, the peasants meet it with the same feeling of hope and alarm: They do not wish to make a mistake or lose time or offend the land that feeds them. This is understandable. That which is not finished in spring cannot be finished later.

We are cheered by the fact that the winter crops and the perennial grasses were preserved better than in past years. In the majority of the regions of the country a good store of moisture has accumulated in the soil. During the winter significant efforts were made to train and retrain the personnel who will function under the new economic conditions.

And what alarms us? The increased amount of field work. It has grown by almost 25 percent over the usual. In addition, because of the general disorder of the economy deliveries to the countryside of equipment, commercial fertilizers, means for protecting the plants, spare parts, fuels, lubricants, etc. have sharply diminished. Over last year alone the countryside was shorted resources worth 7 billion rubles. And this is under conditions where many technical operations are still carried out manually. A good half of active labor resources of agricultural production are involved in them.

But the new pricing policy has perhaps turned out to be the greatest misfortune for the village. Because of the violation of parity of prices and the nonequivalence of exchange with the city, practically everything that has been accumulated is being removed from the rural economy. On a number of farms there are already difficulties with the payment of wages.

Such an approach has nothing in common with the agrarian policy of the party. The 8 April ukase of the president of the country charges the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, the appropriate ministries and departments, and the local organs with correcting the situation, providing relief for the extreme situation which has arisen in the agricultural complex, and mobilizing all existing capability for the speedy and qualitative performance of spring field work over the next month.

A special regimen for providing the necessary resources to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other producers of agricultural goods is being introduced. Measures are envisaged at the state level for enlisting a labor force from enterprises, organizations, and educational institutions for sowing and especially for the harvest.

We all remember what kinds of serious difficulties the urban population experienced because timely aid to the village was not organized last year. The most practical conclusion from this lesson is that we must act quickly and comprehensively to conclude contracts for the participation of city-dwellers in the sowing and harvest efforts. Rural laborers have the right to count on such concern from the local soviet organs.

Land reform should begin to significantly improve the supply of food to the population. The communists in the countryside are called upon to contribute in every way to its implementation and to actively assist in the allocation of plots of land to all who wish so that we will receive additional output from them as early as this year.

At the same time we must not forget that the kolkhozes and sovkhozes remain the basic suppliers of food. Therefore it is not their economic destruction but rather universal support, the mastery of lease and joint-stock relations, cooperation, use of the capabilities of the peasant farms and personal holdings, and wide integration of new forms of management of social production

that will permit us to overcome food difficulties. Each of these forms has its own intrinsic advantages, and they need to be utilized.

The main thing is not to allow a slump in agricultural production, to keep the area of land under cultivation at last year's level and, where possible, to expand that area. But for this it is necessary for the peasant to receive real support from all of society. And it is not merely a question of allocating material resources; workers of trade and the consumer and medical services must constantly take an interest in the laborers of the fields. The people's high spirits are also a great advantage which should be exploited in full measure.

The peasant loves his work and knows how to carry it out. He plays a decisive role in the achievement of the sufficiency and prosperity of every person, taking on the role of the keeper of the fire of our common home. And for that reason alone there is reason to examine the parasitical practice that has arisen in a portion of our society of viewing the peasantry and agricultural production as an inexhaustible source of labor and financial resources.

Today the village itself needs vital and large-scale aid and true priority in economic and social development. It is time to stop seeking the sources of our welfare in the sphere of partition and redistribution. It is only by daily hard and productive labor offering real replenishment of the food market that we will be able to change the life of our people for the better. Bread must become the measure of our conscience.

Military

Arbatov Urges New European Security System

AU3004121791 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 30 Apr 91 p 4

[Interview with Georgi Arbatov, "adviser to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences", by Josef Kirchengast in Prague; date not given: "The Opportunities of the Neutral Countries Will Increase"]

[Text] Prague—Georgi Arbatov is one of the most senior and most experienced foreign-policy advisers of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. Josef Kirchengast conducted an interview with the director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences on the sidelines of the Prague conference on European security.

[Kirchengast] Mr. Arbatov, referring to the future of NATO in a European security system, you warned emphatically against the fatal consequences for Mikhail Gorbachev's policy at the meeting here in Prague. Is it true that Gorbachev's future still lies in the hands of the West, and was it true in the past?

[Arbatov] My statement was not that dramatic. I only pointed out what the West should take into consideration in view of the changed political conditions in the USSR. More than Gorbachev's person is at stake in the current disputes in the Soviet Union. A struggle for his soul as it were is going on. Both camps are trying to win him over. The conservatives, including military officials and other members of the military-industrial complex, are exploiting this issue for their own purposes.

[Kirchengast] Are you talking about the continued existence of NATO whereas the Warsaw Pact has been dissolved?

[Arbatov] One of the favorite arguments of these people is: "The Warsaw Pact is practically dead, and now the West claims that NATO must not only survive but become a permanent institution. Why? Against whom? Does this mean that Western troops will one day stand at the Soviet Union's Western border? We have made a mistake and must reconsider our position now." These people do not think about whether their assessment is right. They are not talking about a revival of the Warsaw Pact. They want to create a fortress Soviet Union.

[Kirchengast] What specifically does this mean?

[Arbatov] They demand more money for the military, or they want to at least prevent a reduction of the military budget and of the troop strengths.

[Kirchengast] Do these people about whom you are talking really still consider NATO in its current form a threat for the USSR?

[Arbatov] Some of them may still see it as a threat.

[Kirchengast] Do you personally view NATO as a threat?

[Arbatov] To be quite honest, I do not see many people in the West who want to occupy the Soviet Union and saddle themselves with all our problems. However, nobody knows what will happen in the future, if the West insists on NATO's continued existence.

Personally I believe that NATO will not survive in the long run. NATO was set up because the there was a supposed enemy—no real enemy because, at least politically, we never seriously believed that we could conquer Europe. Maybe there were some crazy people in some spheres who believed that. Thus, the threat was only assumed. However, now there is no longer an enemy and no opponent. Secretary General Manfred Woerner has confirmed this. So, why should NATO become a permanent institution?

[Kirchengast] The following argument is usually used: NATO is one of the few reliable stability factors in an unstable Europe.

[Arbatov] I understand the fears concerning the further destabilization of Europe. As a matter of fact, there are some destabilizing factors. However, despite that I do not agree with the conclusion. There should be no

institutions that have the function of a curtain. I believe that we should think about some permanent all-European security agreements, but not on the basis of NATO.

[Kirchengast] What would be the best security guarantee for the Soviet Union in central and eastern Europe?

[Arbatov] Let me repeat this once more: I do not believe that people in the Soviet Union feel threatened, not even from a military standpoint. I even believe that conventional wars, like World War II, have become impossible in Europe. I know what I am talking about because I participated in World War II. Over 200 nuclear missiles are stationed in Europe—which corresponds to over 200 potential Chernobyls. Thus, there are a great deal of noxious substances, chemical factories, and propellant depots.

Even without nuclear weapons, the threat is gigantic enough. The desire for security became irrational a long time ago. Personally I think that we should quickly strive for a demilitarization of international relations, of our mentality, and of our economy. However, the situation is as it is, and we must accept the rules of the game. For this reason, there should be a security organization on a broader basis than NATO. Nato should die or be transformed, or God knows what.

[Kirchengast] How do you see the future role of the neutral countries in Europe? Would Austrian EC membership disturb the balance of power in central Europe?

[Arbatov] This is a contentious issue, and I do not want to elaborate because my opinion is not well-founded. Apart from that, I believe that the neutral states in Europe will have the opportunity of playing a more significant role than in the past.

[Kirchengast] In the construction of a new security system as well?

[Arbatov] Yes, the neutral countries may be best suited for paving the way toward a new European security order with new ideas.

Deputy Defense Minister Promoted to Army General

LD3004195191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Apr 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] By a decree of the USSR president Colonel General Yuriy Alekseyevich Yashin has been given the military title of army general.

'Shchit' Chairman Visits Germany

LD2604023891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0721 GMT 25 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Chistyakov]

[Text] Bonn, 25 Apr (TASS)—The establishment and development of contacts with soldiers' and officers' organizations of foreign countries is one of the main purposes of the visit to the FRG by the delegation of the "Shchit" [Shield] Union for the Social Protection of Servicemen, Those Liable for Military Service, and Members of Their Families. Vitaliy Urazhtsev, the chairman of "Shchit" and a deputy of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, and his colleagues arrived here at the invitation of the Union of Servicemen of the Bundeswehr, a kind of trade union organization which bring together more than 250,000 German servicemen and armed forces pensioners.

We consider our main tasks to be the defense of the legitimate rights and interests of servicemen and the provision of social, legal, and material assistance to members of the Union, V. Urazhtsev said in an interview with the TASS correspondent. The experience that has been built up in the FRG, where a similar organization has been in existence for more than 30 years, seems to us to be very interesting and useful. Considerable efforts are made here, including ones in the legislative sphere, to ensure that the "little man in the army uniform feels socially protected, and good results have been achieved.

During intensive talks and conversations with representatives of the Union of Servicemen of the Bundeswehr, the visitors from Moscow have been discussing possibilities for specific cooperation, too. They include, for example, programs for training in civilian trades to Soviet servicemen returning home from FRG territory within the framework of the withdrawal of our troops, for the construction of housing for them, and others.

We are convinced that expanding ties between the servicemen of different countries is one form of people's diplomacy, stressed V. Urazhtsev. Contacts of this kind will promote the eradication of the image of the enemy and the strengthening of trust between peoples. Our immediate task in this field is to join the European Organization of Militayr Associations, "EUROMIL". This matter will be considered at the Regular "EUROMIL" Congress in Paris at the end of April.

Defense Official Criticizes Press Articles

LD3004084291 Moscow TASS in English 0832 GMT 30 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS—"Competent bodies thoroughly investigate each violation of the law in the army. Those neglecting their duties, and especially those who commit crimes, are punished with all the power of Soviet laws," head of the Soviet Defence Ministry's Managing Department Lieutenant-General Leonid Ivashov told TASS.

Ivashov was speaking in connection with debates about the bill on the status of servicemen at the Soviet parliament's Defence and Security Committee.

Ivashov noted that resolute measures are taken with respect to those who try to conceal violations of the law or smooth away their consequences. "As in society, glasnost and openness in the Armed Forces have become a strong and effective means of combating drawbacks," he said.

According to Ivashov, "individualised education, concern over the man, his interests and spiritual state and real, rather than declarative care about his needs and demands" are the main directions of work to eradicate unlawful actions in the Army and Navy. He said this approach yields positive results.

Ivashov said the press could do a lot to settle Army problems by publishing sharp and bitter, but well-considered and concrete articles. He said there are few such articles. "Other articles prevail in the Soviet press, describing hooliganism in army barracks. Such articles are playing far from a constructive role," Ivashov said.

Baltic Republics

Savisaar Attacked by Both Right, Left

91UN1262A Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 2 Apr 91 p 4

[Article by Hannes Gamillscheg: "We Can Only Work Our Way Out Through Wisdom and Cunning"]

[Text] Tallinn—Estonia's People's Front government feels that the outcome of the recent elections has served to affirm its policies. But the domestic policy debate which receded into the background during the preparations for the Estonian referendum has now started anew with full force. The government of Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar is being violently criticized by both the right and the left. Both the radical nationalists and the reform Communists accuse the government of not making a strong enough effort to achieve independence.

Jaak Allik, the chief idelogist of the reform Communist movement "Free Estonia," accused Savisaar of acting as though he were the first prime minister of an independent Estonia rather than the last prime minister of an Estonia which is still in the process of reestablishing its independence. Allik, whose party does not collaborate with the Moscow-style Estonian Communist Party, charges that the government is engaged in "illusory activities" instead of establishing genuine boundaries between Estonia and the rest of the Soviet Union, printing its own currency, and concluding "binding agreements" with the Soviet Union on the status of the Soviet forces inside Estonia.

Separatist Burlesque

While the Moscow-directed "Interfront" labelled the Estonian legislature as a "separatist burlesque," the reform Communists along with the other Estonian political parties boycotted the Soviet referendum.

But it is not only the left which is criticizing the Savisaar government. The "Estonian Congress," dominated by the radical Estonian National Independence Party (ERSP), charges the legislature and the government with maintaining inordinately close ties with the Soviet system. The basic tenet of the congress—a counterlegislature elected solely by Estonians—is the principle of "legal continuity," i.e. that the republic, which gained independence in 1920, continues to exist even though it has been illegally occupied since 1940. Estonia cannot enter into negotiations or vote on leaving the Soviet Union because it never joined it. The republic must be reestablished on the basis of the laws, the population makeup, and the property rights that obtained in 1920. At that time, 90 percent of Estonia's inhabitants were Estonians as against only 60 percent today.

The congress also opposes Savisaar's efforts to obtain Western recognition of the government and the legislature as the sole legal representatives of Estonia. The radical nationalists would rather have Estonia recognized as an "occupied country."

Viewed as a symbol of "national awakening" only one year ago, the Estonian Congress lost much of its popularity by adopting these radical positions. The appeal of the congress for a boycott of the Estonian independence referendum fell on deaf ears. In localities with an Estonian majority, almost all inhabitants took part in the referendum. The prestige of the nationalist wing suffered greatly when it joined forces with the reform Communists last winter in an attempt to topple the Savisaar government. According to the latest polls not even five percent of all Estonians still support the uncompromising policies of the Estonian congress.

This serves to strengthen the Savisaar government which is trying to get negotiations with Moscow started, but has thus far been unable to find any takers there. Savisaar, however, is dependent on compromises. While the Latvian and Lithuanian legislatures are dominated by the local people's fronts, the Estonian People's Front only has 40 of the 105 seats in the "Upper Council" which far more accurately reflects the demographic makeup of the country.

An attempt by Savisaar to call for new elections in order to put an end to the "transition period" proclaimed one year ago, was then duly shot down by the opposition. But for the moment there is no alternative to Savisaar. Within the People's Front, to be sure, social democratic, liberal and agrarian parties have emerged, which are collaborating with the green movement, which is not part of the People's Front. But the leaders of these parties continue to support the prime minister who thus far has not joined any one of the political parties.

Referendum an Endorsement, Government Feels

Marju Lauristin, a leading member of the Social Democratic Party, who was offered the post of prime minister by the radical nationalists and the reform Communists, turned the offer down, saying: "I am not a deserter."

The government feels that its policies were endorsed by the outcome of the Estonian referendum in which 78 percent of the population voted for independence. Savisaar described these policies as follows: "We know that we cannot leave the Soviet Union by waging war or by buying our way out. We can only work our way out through wisdom and cunning."

In spite of irregularities, the Soviet referendum in Estonia came out more or less as expected. The government boycotted the referendum, but did not hamper the Russian organizations in exercising their prerogatives. According to Interfront, 95 percent of the "more than 250,000 participants" voted "yes," i.e. for the Union. This figure roughly corresponds to the 203,000 voters who voted "no" in the Estonian referendum.

Baltic Communists Hold Congress in Riga

PM3004093291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent O. Meshkov report: "Congress of Baltic Communists"]

[Text] Riga—For the first time, a congress of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Communists has taken place. It was held in Riga on 27 April. Its participants are of the unanimous opinion that it will undoubtedly reinforce links and strengthen the unity of the Baltic Communists' activities.

The congress was attended by 324 delegates, with every third delegate a representative of the republics' indigenous population. A question "On the Strategy and Tactics of the Latvian, Estonian, and Lithuanian Communist Parties in the Existing Sociopolitical Situation, and Tasks for Coordinating the Efforts of Communists Against the Forcible Breakaway by Soviet Baltic Republics from the USSR" was submitted for discussion by the Communists.

Participants in the congress' work included V. Kuptsov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; A. Melnikov, secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee; V. Tikhinya, secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; V. Lisovenko, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; as well as Moscow Communist representatives and representatives of Russian oblast party organizations.

The first secretaries of the Baltic republic communist party central committees delivered detailed reports. The following in particular was stressed: Events in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have developed as if according to one scenario—separatist forces exploited the chance offered in conditions of perestroyka to operate freely and without fear and took into their hands practically all of the mass media and, after winning the elections, resolutely opted for a policy of secession from the USSR. M. Burokevicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, appealed for a condemnation of the decision by several Western countries to establish diplomatic relations with the Baltic republics as if they had already left the Soviet Union. In fact there is a long way to go before actual and full independence is achieved, as the People's Front leaders themselves admit. All the more so, stressed the speaker, as Lithuania is now going through the most severe economic crisis. He announced some interesting figures. If Lithuania does not sign the Union treaty it will have to pay for supplies of raw and other materials at world prices and in hard currency. Economists estimate that this will require an annual sum of $3.7 billion, whereas the republic only has $1.6 billion at its disposal.

M. Burokevicius' claims that the working people of Lithuania are gaining greater insight, seeing the antidemocratic course of the pro-Sajudist government and the futility of its policy, were confirmed in the speech by Lithuanian peasant T. Leinartene. She also spoke about the moral terror to which those disagreeing with the separatists are subjected, and the authorities' attempts at blockade, preventing the broad masses from gaining access to central newspapers, magazines, and broadcasts on Central Television. But many, many people—judging by the results of the nationwide referendum—still harbor a very strong desire to remain part of the USSR in the years to come. And this cannot be ignored.

A. Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, and S. Dimanis, leader of the "Ravnopraviye" [Equal Rights] faction, spoke about the current Latvian leadership's inability to lead the republic out of the crisis, breaking the traditional links with the country. Reliance on economic links with the Western market is unrealistic. The following example was given. At the end of the 1980's, Latvia exported only three percent of its industrial output and most of that went to CEMA countries, while even fewer agricultural goods were exported. Today the volume of exports is much reduced, so the question arises as to what can be expected.

"We are like doctors at the bedside of a seriously ill patient, conferring on how to save his life." This is the gloomy comparison which opened the speech by L. Annus, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee. He continued: The Communist Party is going through a serious crisis. In Estonia, a number of circumstances are rendering this process even more painful. L. Annus expressed concern that the CPSU leadership is observing the many processes so calmly, whereas the Estonian Communists consider it inadmissible not to react to them. Is it not a paradox, the speaker continued, that two Communist Parties are officially recognized in Estonia even though they stand on diametrically opposed platforms and have different aims. If Estonia does not sign the Union treaty, L. Annus said, what is in store for us Communists? Obviously we can expect the same fate as the Communist Parties in East European countries. This cannot be acceptable to members of the Estonian Communist Party.

Incidentally, a number of other speeches also echoed this thought. Serious and sensible suggestions were submitted. For example, it was suggested that a coordination center be created, headed by the first secretaries of the Baltic Communist Party Central Committees, and also that the role of the labor collectives in enterprises under Union jurisdiction be increased in the political struggle with separatism. Delegates were alarmed that the renowned statement by the 10 Supreme Soviet chairmen and leaders does not clarify the issue of the republics' fate. Including the fate of the Baltic republics not wishing to sign the Union treaty.

A resolution on the political situation and the tasks facing Communists states the paramount need to restore the enforcement of the Constitution of the USSR and of all three Soviet Baltic republics. It is recommended that

some common ground be located regarding interests and cooperation with other parties and movements. It has been decided to work actively to privatize enterprises under Union jurisdiction and to carry out the free transfer of a proportion of public property to labor collectives.

The congress participants referred to the need for an effective and all-embracing system of social welfare for each working individual in the complex conditions of the modern-day Baltic region.

A number of other important resolutions and statements were also adopted. At this point the congress concluded its work.

Meeting 'Important' Beyond Baltics

LD2904133491 Moscow TASS in English 1229 GMT 29 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga April 29 TASS—The Congress of Baltic Communists provided the first forum at which party organisations from several republics can jointly plan their actions in the framework of the Soviet Communist Party, Secretary of the Soviet Communists Party Committee Valentin Kuptsov told a news conference here on Sunday.

He believes the congress was a new manifestation of real political activity by the Soviet Communist Party and important beyond the framework of the three Baltic republics.

Heads of delegations from the communist parties of Russia, the Ukraine and Belorussia agreed with Kuptsov. A conference of secretaries of central committees of the communist parties of six Union republics, held on Sunday upon the conclusion of the congress, discussed the tasks that will be facilitated by mutual exchanges of experience and information.

Communists form the opposition in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Although the new authorities in the Baltic republics refuse to discuss a Union treaty, let alone sign it, the communist parties urge peoples and members of republican parliaments to look for new ways to implement sovereignty within the framework of a unified state.

In Estonia, for instance, an inter-regional council of people's deputies is conducting alternative negotiations and consultations with representatives of the union at the level of experts. Chief of the Latvian Communist Party Alfred Rubiks said that Latvian Communists will be pressing for the right to participate in shaping the government.

Each Baltic Republic has its own specific features, but the communists of the Baltic republics have a common task, to restore in full the operation of Soviet laws, above all the constitution of the USSR, it was emphasised at the news conference. It was also agreed to exchange regularly information about parties' activity and of socio-political information. Supporters of the programme will go to different regions of the country to gather followers.

Riga Meeting on Withdrawal of Forces Held

PM2904145791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

["Direct Line" report by Colonel M. Ziyeminsh: "'Concept of Withdrawal of Forces' Already Exists"]

[Text] Riga—A news conference held at the Latvian legislature was devoted completely to military problems. First and foremost, the so-called "concept of the withdrawal of forces from Latvia" was submitted, which is intended to be the subject of talks with the USSR. But, as I found out, the "concept" was discussed and approved beforehand at a joint sitting of the commissions for defense and internal affairs of the legislatures of all three Baltic republics.

The document envisages that "the withdrawal of Soviet Forces can take place in stages over a period of approximately two years, and its procedure can be regulated by a special treaty."

It seemed to me to be highly indicative that the organizers of the news conference highlighted the "international conference on defense questions" that was held recently near Tallinn. An eminent Finnish specialist on... partisan warfare took part in the work of the conference. Why should this be?

Latvian Supreme Soviet Deputy Interviewed

PM3004104791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Apr 91 Union Edition p 3

[Interview with Andrejs Krastyns, first deputy chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, by I. Litvinova; first paragraph is introduction; date and place of interview not stated: "Andrejs Krastyns: Real Independence? In Two Years' Time"]

[Excerpts] In Moscow a meeting took place between delegations of the USSR and the Latvian Republic. Your IZVESTIYA correspondent talks with Andrejs Krastyns, first deputy chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, about the problems which are giving rise to different assessments in Moscow and Riga.

[Litvinova] Andrejs, nearly a year ago, at the first press conference since the adoption of the declaration on the restoration of independence, to my question "Can it now be considered that Latvia is a foreign state in relation to the USSR?" you replied: "Yes, it is." I want to repeat that question a year later.

[Krastyns] Now, too, a year later, I can make the same reply. Here there are two criteria: One is purely legal, the other consists of factual circumstances. The Latvian

Republic is a foreign state in relation to the USSR and was illegally included in the USSR in 1940.

For 50 years the Soviet Union, keeping Latvia as part of itself, increasingly integrated the republic's economy, and it is that factor which is holding us back. [passage omitted]

[Litvinova] After shedding light on some nuances of the past, let's return to present-day problems. So, a year ago it was proclaimed that Latvia was declaring the restoration of its independence. But how was this reflected in real life?

[Krastyns] After 4 May 1990 we began to create independent state structures in Latvia. Legally they are not subordinate to Moscow and base their activity on the laws adopted by the Latvian Supreme Soviet.

Where has our independence shown itself? Primarily in the system of the state apparatus, which differs from the Soviet model. Then there is our own economic model which, it is true, does not always accord with our wishes since we have to consider existing ties with the Soviet Union.

[Litvinova] In the fall you headed the first commission for talks with the USSR. As far a I know it ended without results. Why? And will the new talks be more successful?

[Krastyns] Let's be specific about what our commission engaged in. One avenue was the talks with the Russian Federation, the other was consultations with representatives of the USSR on the possibility of beginning interstate talks. Contacts with the USSR leaders were not particularly successful inasmuch as the Union commission had virtually no powers. Considering the personalities of the people with whom we sat down at the conference table—Nishanov, Revenko, Doguzhiyev—one could understand that they intended to persuade us to sign the Union treaty.

A fully empowered working group has now been created under the leadership of Ilmar Bishers, first deputy chairman of the Latvian Republic Council of Ministers. But this time, too, the aim was merely consultations. We are seeking the initiation of serious talks with the Soviet Union, and without prior conditions. Before initiating them we must probably define the ultimate goal. For us it is the restoration of the Latvian state's independence.

[Litvinova] In an interview with the newspaper ATMODA, Indulis Berzinysh, deputy chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Commission for Foreign Affairs, said that there is no point in sitting down at the conference table only with the Union, the Baltic issue must be internationalized.

[Krastyns] Yes, that is also my opinion, and I have voiced it at meetings with many foreign delegations. We need guarantees at the talks. We believe, and our fellow thinkers in the West also believe, that the Baltic issue is an international [mezhdunarodnyy], inter-nation [internatsionalnyy] issue.

[Litvinova] Since we have touched on the international law aspect of the problem, it is probably worth recalling the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, the Helsinki documents, and, finally, the Paris agreement. All these documents recognize the inviolability of postwar borders.

[Krastyns] Recently the United States announced that it recognizes the Soviet Union in its 1933 borders. To this day the secret appendices to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements have not been published and we do not know how the Baltic issue was resolved purely formally in these documents. That secret has not been revealed by the Soviet Union, the United States, or other countries of the coalition. As for the Helsinki documents, they contain a stipulation which the Soviet Union usually omits in its publications. There was mention of the impermissibility of the violence alteration of borders.

[Litvinova] In that case will we succeed in avoiding a serious international conflict? After all, the Soviet side lodged a protest against the U.S. statement on its recognition of the USSR within its 1933 borders.

[Krastyns] We should probably understand that diplomatic statements are one thing and practical diplomacy another. Take the fresh example of the disputed Kuril Islands. The change in the USSR's position is obvious.

[Litvinova] I would ask you, Andrejs, to describe today's situation in the republic. How is society living, who possesses people's minds, with what do they link their hopes, and what alarms them?

[Krastyns] I shall begin with the last point, with alarm. They are increasingly perturbed by the Latvian Republic's economic position. The inevitable increase in prices has considerably reduced the population's prosperity.

Against the background of economic difficulties there can be seen the desire of some political groups to take revenge for the defeat at last year's elections. I am not mentioning here the Latvian Communist Party and all those linked with that organization. That is a particular political force which operates outside the structures of the Latvian Republic. Recently the Union of Agricultural Workers and representatives of the Democratic Labor Party, that is the section of the Latvian Communist Party which has changed color and cut itself off along national lines, have been leveling quite fierce criticism against the government and Supreme Soviet.

As for the majority of the Latvian population, I think they support the desire to restore independence. For ethnic Latvians the question is unequivocal. The same also applies to the so-called old Russians, who lived here before 1940. The majority of young businessmen, irrespective of nationality, are in favor of independence.

There is also a section of the population which categorically opposes independence. In my view these are retired officers and members of their families. They are physically unable to accept their isolation from the Soviet Union. That section of the republic's population

which is restricted in its sources of information, especially in Lettish, is also opposed to independence.

[Litvinova] Forgive me, here I would not agree with you, Andrejs. Sometimes, when I read the Latvian press it seems to me: Thank god all these streams of insults and humiliating proposals for the future are bypassing those to whom they are addressed. Here is a very small example for you. How should non-Latvians interpret the appeal of the radical People's Front association: "We urge foreigners living in Latvia...to return to their places of ethnic origin without waiting for the advent of a critical stage in interethnic contradictions?" After all, that is an overt threat.

[Krastyns] I agree that many politicians are voicing undemocratic opinions in their publications. Nonetheless, let anyone preach his own thoughts, unless he is calling for violence.

You must understand that it is natural that, in considering the past, not all Latvians have good feelings about the Russians. But talk of possible repatriation, of the expulsion of the Russians, can be conducted only by people who do not engage in real politics.

[Litvinova] Would the simplest solution to the problem not be to put human rights first and only then the rights of the nation? Respect for the rights of a person of any nationality would probably give a guarantee of political stability in the republic. Would such a civilized approach not suit both the Latvians and the Russians and the inhabitants of other nationalities?

[Krastyns] Our opponents often place human rights at the basis of the entire political process in the republic. Well, I do not argue with them. But it seems to me that in our documents there are elements not of the violation of human rights, but of the curtailment of some people's privileges. For instance, with regard to Patriotic War veterans. We have decided that now all those who fought in World War II will receive benefits, irrespective of whose side they were on. As for our other documents, we have handed them over for independent expert analysis in Norway.

[Litvinova] You remain a supporter of the concept you put forward according to which citizenship cannot be granted to military men, KGB staffers, and members of communist organizations?

[Krastyns] Yes, I adhere to that viewpoint. But after all that is also worldwide practice. Staffers of the Latvian branch of the USSR KGB have stated that they obey primarily USSR laws. In that case what citizenship of the Latvian Republic can we talk of? The Latvian Communist Party is essentially the party of a foreign state. It is a political force which is struggling against Latvia's independence. Can we give citizenship to Communist Party leader Rubiks, if he is doing everything to oppose the restoration of independence? Although under the 1919 law he is undoubtedly a citizen of the Latvian Republic.

[Litvinova] The concept also presupposes various conditions for obtaining citizenship: taking laws [as published] in Latvian language, history, and culture, and a settlement qualification....

[Krastyns] Yes, that is all the case. But those who elaborated the concept drew these conditions from the experience of other states. That is normal international practice.

[Litvinova] But after all the law will be retroactive for hundreds of thousands of people. When they came here many years ago no one imposed any conditions. Work for the benefit of Latvia, help to restore destroyed postwar life. But now in their old age they have no certainty: We may pass or fail the test, we may or may not receive the right to be citizens of the land where our lives have been spent.

[Krastyns] Yes, problems may arise. But you must understand that we cannot automatically award citizenship of the restored Latvian Republic.

[Litvinova] Recently the legislative commission submitted a version of the Latvian Constitution of the transitional period. You expressed yourself critically about this draft. Why?

[Krastyns] We discussed the draft at the strategy group of the People's Front faction and rejected it almost unanimously. The creation of a new Constitution means under international law the creation of a new state. That does not suit us.

[Litvinova] In an interview with Latvian radio you said that the present legislature will exist until 1993. In connection with this statement I have several questions to ask at once. First, on what is your forecast based. Second, what will be the fate of the present deputies? And, third, who will elect the Seimas, which citizens?

[Krastyns] My forecast is based on an analysis of the political situation. Western experts also predict that 1991 may become the year when our independence will be restored de facto. That depends on the Soviet Union and on other states. The next year would be the period of the formation of various independent structures, a period of the economy's stabilization. I have also calculated how much money and time is needed to hold new elections. The soonest elections to the Seimas can be held is the spring or fall of 1993.

[Litvinova] The restoration of independence for Latvia is also connected with some territorial questions. If we return to the Latvian Republic of 1918, there arise Estonia's territorial claims on Latvia and Latvia's claims on Russia....

[Krastyns] I am 100 percent convinced that we shall have no territorial conflicts with Estonia and we shall reach agreement in an entirely peaceful manner. As for Pytalovskiy Rayon, Pskov Oblast, we regard these lands as our territory and will discuss the matter at talks with Russia. From the purely legal viewpoint, if we restore the

state as it was before 1940, it should be within the same borders. If there are sober minded people in power in Russia, I think we will reach agreement.

[Litvinova] In the fall, when the Latvian legislature was deciding whether to send representatives of the republic to Moscow to discuss an economic agreement, the opinion was voiced that it would be a betrayal of the interests of the Lettish people. But reality has forced you not only to go to Moscow but also to take part in the formation of the USSR budget, to consider monetary and price reforms in the Soviet Union, to discuss conditions for payment of the Union debt, and so forth. It looks as though when the word "Union" is mentioned your premier Ivars Godmanis now remembers not the empire but coal, oil, and mixed feed. This position is called "incipient signing of the Union treaty" by radical circles. What in your opinion will ultimately gain the upper hand: abstract political principles or economic expediency?

[Krastyns] I think that something in between will gain the upper hand. Of course we cannot take part officially in agreements as a Union republic. Legally that would mean that we recognized ourselves de fact as part of the Union. But purely pragmatic interests force us to visit Moscow and do some business. As for the Union currency debt, I am categorically opposed to conducting any talks on our participation in its payment prior to the restoration of Latvia's independence. When the Union recognizes us de jure, we shall sit down at the conference table to discuss this question, too. After all, we believe that the Union owes us colossal sums and state interests do not allow us for the time being to conduct dialogue on any payments.

The ideal option for relations with the Soviet Union as of today is to conclude a multifaceted economic treaty which would in no way be connected with politics.

[Litvinova] Thank you for the conversation.

Latvia Protests Baltic Soldiers' Union Moves

LD3004060791 Riga Radio Riga International Service in English 2030 GMT 29 Apr 91

[Text] A defense and domestic affairs commission of the Latvian Supreme Council adopted an appeal to the headquarters of the Baltic Military region, demanding it stop the activities of the Baltic Soldiers' Union since its program is obviously unconstitutional. As we already reported, the draft program of the soldiers' union envisages even the use of military force in case the interests of the Soviet Army are endangered. Elaborating on the same issue, Alfred Rubiks, first secretary of Latvia's Communist Party, named the Baltic Soldiers' Union as a reliable ally for prompt and energetic action in extreme situations. The general prosecutor of the republic of Latvia has announced in his turn that in case a project of the Baltic Soldiers' Union is accepted, he will ask the prosecutor of the Baltic military region to suspend the legal activities of the union.

Latvian Dispute With Moscow Over Budget Noted

LD3004223591 Riga Radio Riga International Service in English 2030 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Latvia's Minister for Finance Elmars Silins has returned from yet another unproductive visit to Moscow. As yet, no agreement has been reached on Latvia's contribution to the Soviet Union's budget. The Soviet Union's Ministry for Finance is demanding an additional 458 million rubles to cover this year's budget deficit. Latvia has been threatened with consequent economic sanctions if this demand is not met.

During his meeting, Elmars Silins made clear Latvia's point of view regarding the Soviet Union's 1992 budget, in that Latvia intends to make no contributions.

Landsbergis Forced To Delay FRG Visit

LD0105001191 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian legislature, has postponed his visit to the FRG, scheduled for 1-3 May. The Supreme Council press representative noted at this morning's briefing that the trip was postponed on account of the worsening situation in Lithuania and the recent actions of the military. Especially disquieting is the fact that neither the Soviet Union's leadership nor the Baltic Military District's heads are avoiding contact with Lithuania. According to the press representative, this is reminiscent of the beginning of January, when having already been informed of the threatening upheaval, the Lithuanian leadership had in vain tried to contact the Kremlin. As was reported at the briefing, yesterday Vytautas Landsbergis again phoned USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev. However, he was told that the president was busy. He was also unsuccessful in reaching Viktor Ovcharov, deputy chief of the Baltic Military District, yesterday. These and other reasons forced the chairman of the Lithuanian legislature to postpone his trip to the FRG.

Landsbergis Wants Talks on Norway Pact

PM3004124391 Oslo ARBEIDERBLADET in Norwegian 25 Apr 91 p 16

[Nina Johnsrud report: "Landsbergis Asks Norway for an Explanation"]

[Text] The revelations concerning the agreement entered into in 1959 between Prime Minister Einar Gerhardsen and the government of Nikita Khrushchev became known in Lithuania yesterday. According to Professor Tore Opsahl, the treaty amounts to legal recognition of the Soviet Union's annexation of the Baltic states. This runs completely counter to official Norwegian policy and comes as a great surprise to Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis, who has praised Norway on several occasions.

"We are ready to talk about this with the Norwegian authorities. Since it is clear that the treaty can be interpreted as recognition of the Baltic states as part of the Soviet Union, Norway must clear up this contradiction. We have no desire to view you as a two-faced country," Vytautas Landsbergis told ARBEIDERBLADET.

He drew a parallel with the secrecy surrounding the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact which was signed when Nazi Germany and Communist Russia divided Europe between them in 1939 and in which Germany accepted that the Baltic region was Soviet territory.

"This agreement was also long kept secret. When it came to light it was declared illegal from the day it was signed. This could be a possible solution for the agreement between Norway and the Soviet Union. There is no reason for the new generation of politicians not to correct the mistakes of the old generation," Landsbergis said.

In the event of the treaty being declared illegal, Lithuania is wondering whether there is Norwegian property in the Baltic region, and whether the Norwegian Government has kept copies of the ownership papers and certificates which were handed over to the Soviet Union. From Article 4 of the treaty it would seem that all documents relating to property and claims are now in the Soviet Union.

According to the treaty, to abandon its claims to this property Norway received half a million kroner from the Soviet Union. What property is involved here in what the Foreign Ministry describes as a "practical settlement" is classified "top secret," like everything else apart from the treaty itself.

"Economics and politics are always interconnected," Landsbergis said.

Army Claim to Lithuanian DOSAAF Property Contested

PM3004142791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 91 p 1

[Feature comprising report by Lithuanian Republic Government Press Bureau and commentary by correspondent V. Zarovskiy under general headline: "Special-Purpose Militia Unit's Battle With DOSAAF"]

[Text] During the night of 24-25 April servicemen of the USSR Armed Forces attacked installations of the "Vitis" state technical sports organization—technical schools in Siauliai, Kaunas, Alytus, Marijampole, Klaipeda, and Panevezys, the Signalas Hotel in Alytus, the "Sauletekis" state enterprise in Vilnius, flying clubs in Kyviskes and Palukne, and the sports aircraft plant in Prienai. They seized vehicles, heavy equipment, construction cranes, motor vehicle tires, construction materials, and tools belonging to these organizations and smashed furniture and equipment in some buildings. Great material damage was done. In Kaunas the leaders of military groups presented the leaders of the radio engineering school in the old city and of the technical school in Aleksotas with an order from General Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military District, on the basis of which they confiscated equipment and vehicles and took everything away on military truck tractors.

The leaders of the Alytus, Kaunas, Klaipeda, Marijampole, and other technical schools were told that if they did not surrender all available equipment in the so-called group "A" in the very near future, they would be handed over to the authorities of the USSR Military Prosecutor's Office and the schools' premises would be occupied.

In all, approximately almost 100 vehicles of various makes, tractors, truck cranes, trawls, motorcycles, and other property were seized.

Incidentally, in conversation with V. Landsbergis on 24 April USSR First Deputy Prime Minister V. Doguzhiyev declared that there can be no question of the use of force and that problems must be resolved by political means. The Government of the Lithuanian Republic is demanding the immediate return of the buildings and property seized. If the rampage by the military continues, the Lithuanian Government will be unable to give guarantees that its citizens will not have recourse to counteractions.

Commentary by V. Zarovskiy, our correspondent in Lithuania:

What attitude should one take toward the recent reports from Lithuania? During one evening paratroopers and that same old special-purpose militia detachment seized more than 10 (!) installations of the former DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy], including the famous glider plant in Prienai, which produces the exceptionally reliable and fine Lietuva aircraft. The USSR Ministry of Defense Press Center declared that they had returned "property to its lawful owner." But, pardon me: For decades the Lithuanians, like the entire Soviet people, punctiliously bought DOSAAF stamps and paid membership dues. Throughout these years DOSAAF was a compulsory-voluntary society which **promoted** the army and navy. On what grounds is it now maintained that all this—plant, building, machines—belongs to the military? And who, tell me, would risk investing money in a country where people with submachine guns can burst into the economy's holy of holies—banks?

This is what I thought: If everything is done on the pretext of protecting Union property, would it be a good thing first to determine what this means? And at once announce to bewildered citizens all the installations which, in the opinion of strategists, fall within the army's sphere of interests. Incidentally, what is still left there: railroad, telegraph, airports?

Lithuanian Moves Toward Own Army Deplored

PM2904135391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Apr 91 First Edition p 4

[Captain Second Rank V. Gromak article: "'We Will Have Our Own Army,' They Declare in Lithuania. But the Army Has Actually Been Created Already"]

[Text] It is no secret to anyone that the new Lithuanian regime intends to set up its own army. Back in the fall nobody treated such actions seriously, although the process itself began virtually after the proclamation of independence in March last year. Meanwhile, leaders of the republic are trying not to parade such questions before the world public.

What is it all linked to? Primarily, I think, to the "domestic tasks" for which the Lithuanian Army will be made responsible. I will now try to prove this.

Back in the fall it was declared that 1991 is the year for creating their own army. By that time their own defense structures had already taken shape in the form of the government Territorial Defense Department. Now it is planned to carry out a draft of young people into its ranks. Numbers are even being cited—from 10,000 to 15,000 people. And it is all entirely realistic.

On 17 January department staffers seized over 100 firearms from officers responsible for taking in surrendered guns. A training company is operating openly. On 11 April V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet, himself congratulated 400 volunteers who had taken the oath. Why is all this being created?

At a recent meeting with foreign journalists the department's general director, A. Butkevicius, again decided against being frank with them, repeating for the umpteenth time: "Our aim is to defend Lithuania, to defend our motherland." High-flown words, but for foreign consumption, so to speak. There are considerably more specifics in the "domestic market." What is actually behind all this fuss about the department is immediately obvious. It is sufficient to quote a television speech by the same Butkevicius:

"As of today our republic's territorial defense breaks down into four main areas of activity.

"The first is the so-called special services, such as the border zone and the protection of important installations. I am convinced that today we in Lithuania must protect a number of installations and are committed to doing so. The second important area is the emergency services, the firefighting service, and a civil defense system.

"The third area is a system for a voluntary Lithuanian Republic Territorial Defense Service, the creation of an embryo of our National Guard. Therefore we will endeavor to ensure that every rayon in Lithuania has a detachment of patriotically inclined people, volunteers who would make up our primary training reserve—that is, to ensure that there are people on whom we can call for help if necessary. This is a group of people who would be well trained and know their job very well.

"The fourth area is the core of a regular army, an embryo, if the republic government decides that it should be established....

"It is quite clear that in Lithuania, as in other republics and countries, a stabilizing force is needed; that is, one that would take away from the party or any other organization even the desire and even the thought that it could secure its way to power with the aid of force. I think that the only such force should be a strong territorial defense system."

It is no accident that I have quoted this television speech so fully. If all hints are discarded it is immediately obvious that a new army and national guard will not so much do duty for external territorial defense as start to fulfill political functions inside the republic. Especially as cleansing the republic of "unpatriotic elements" has virtually already started. The main role here is fulfilled by Butkevicius' department with its "patriotically inclined people."

There are currently few journalists in rural regions. But it is precisely here that Butkevicius' "firm" has taken on the duties of "propagandist and organizer." For example, they are trying to convince the peasants that the paths of the republic and the Union have diverged. But these are only words, and one does not have to listen to them. But what if moral arguments prove insufficient? As a rule the department officials are not fussy about using threats.

First on the receiving end, of course, are Communists. There are many examples. Z. Razminas, inspector of the Shaulyayskiy Rayon Territorial Defense Department, required the secretary of the Shaulyayskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Rayon Committee to "vacate the premises." So far this is only a threat. But the same Razminas, with two assistants brandishing weapons, conducted a search at the workplace of Ju. Kucinskiene, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party's "Scakine" sovkhoz [state farm] party organization, and then beat the woman up....

True, the forces available to the department are still not very great. Lately its leaders have repeatedly reminded republic leaders of this. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet reacted quite quickly to the "reprimands," adopting a law on voluntary territorial defense service.

What is it intended to do? First of all, recruits are to be selected. For the time being this will be done on a voluntary basis. Here the draftees are subdivided into operational, nonoperational, and ceremonial [pochetnyye] volunteers. Militarized formations are created on a territorial basis. Companies, detachments, and regiments (druzhini] will come into operation. A regimental

commander is appointed by the department's general director and the remaining command personnel by the chief of staff.

It is proposed that it has its own officers, too. What do they think will attract them into the service? The ace in the hole: Eight years after the start of an officer's service in post a person who wants to retire is granted a free loan for the construction of his own house or acquisition of an apartment on advantageous terms. True, it is not clear where so many apartments will come from. Lithuanian Vice Premier Z. Vajsvila came to the rescue; he said frankly that the housing problem will be solved at the expense of... Soviet Army officers, who "will be forced to quit Lithuania in any event."

Officer courses are already in progress in Kaunas, and a training subunit is operating in Vilnius, where warrant officers are being trained. Scheduled volunteer training is going on.

"A volunteer," I. Gecas, chief of the department's staff says, "is a person who does not give up his permanent job and comes to us for training only temporarily, in accordance with a contract."

Passing this "thorough and comprehensive test" (I quote the document) is what the future professional and volunteer studies four times a week for. Then once a year he must spend 20 days at a training center, where if necessary he might also be used "to fulfill various tasks," if "the circumstances require it."

As we can see, the USSR president's appeal that all illegal military formations be disbanded has not found the required degree of understanding among Lithuanian deputies. On the contrary, they have created a powerful lever with the aid of which it is easy to influence the situation in the republic. And, it must be said, they are being highly successful in this direction.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Participates in Novokuznetsk May Day Rally

LD0105093791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0900 GMT 1 May 91

[Text] In the Kuzbass, May Day rallies and demonstrations are taking place in towns and villages. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, participated in a rally in Novokuznetsk. This year's May Day will be a memorable day for the miners of the basin, because the head of the republican legislature signed at a meeting a decision on the transfer of the Kuzbass coal industry to Russian jurisdiction. It is necessary to become involved in active work to stabilize the economy in the republic, said Boris Nikolayevich to those gathered at the square.

Reportage on Yeltsin's Visit With Miners

Informs Miners on Power Transfer

LD3004124991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] who is in Kemerovo Oblast, met with Prokopyevsk miners. All mining enterprises are still on strike there. Yeltsin told miners about the work of republican bodies in transferring the USSR Ministry of Coal Industry mines to RSFSR jurisdiction and assured them that they will be freed of departmental control. As for the strike, it is up to workers to decide whether to continue or stop it, said the head of the Russian legislature. He spoke at meetings in Prokopyevsk and Kiselevsk.

Updates Workers on Meeting Results

LD3004124591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] The visit to the Kuzbass by Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, is continuing. A meeting between him and the expanded aktiv of the region's workers' committees took place in Novokuznetsk. It was devoted mainly to the results of the meeting between the leaders of the nine Union republics and the USSR president. In particular, Boris Yeltsin told miners about those results of the meeting which, in his opinion, are of a positive significance. First, in the immediate future the status of the Union republics will change. They will virtually become sovereign states with their own independent internal and foreign policy. No more than three or four functions will remain at the center. The republics of the Baltics, Moldova, Armenia, and Georgia will themselves decide the question of whether or not to join the Union treaty. In accordance with the agreement reached, the Union power bodies will be subject to a fundamental reconstruction. Their modernization during the last few years, as was noted during the meeting, did not weaken the administrative command system, but, on the contrary, strengthened it. It has now been decided to make the elections of the USSR president nationwide.

At the meeting, Boris Yeltsin acquainted representatives of the strike committees with a draft on depoliticizing the Army, KGB, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and other state structures.

In the opinion of our correspondent in Novokuznetsk, this meeting dealt with many acute issues that existed before the arrival of the head of the Russian legislature. At the meeting miners proposed Boris Yeltsin as a candidate for the post of president of Russia. A collection of signatures in support of this decision has now begun in the Kuzbass.

As we report this news, Boris Yeltsin is at the Western Siberian Metallurgical Combine. As we were told by the Novokuznetsk strike committee, the miners intend to

continue their strike until the document on the transfer of enterprises to the jurisdiction of Russia is signed by the USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic leadership. At the moment, 42 mines are not working, six mines are not dispatching coal to consumers, and seven mines are working in accordance with a decision by the strike committee in order to meet the needs of the region's towns.

Notes Joint Statement

LD3004151491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, met today with miners in the town of Kiselevsk, where the political strike by all coal enterprises is continuing. He told the miners about the work being done by the republic's bodies to transfer mines to Russian jurisdiction. As for the strike, the head of the Russian legislature said that the question of whether to continue or halt it is a matter for the workers themselves.

The chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet also voiced the opinion that the miners should keep up their political demands. He declared himself against abolishing the strike committees, which he said constitutes links with the Russian bodies of authority and administration.

Boris Yeltsin assured the miners that the reason the leaders of the nine republics signed the joint statement with the USSR president was not to help Mikhail Gorbachev out. The country has to be saved, he said. Having proposed that Gorbachev should be given a last chance, Boris Yeltsin emphasized that this is all the more the case now that the president has moved away from his previous position of not acknowledging the demands of the republics.

Siberian Mine Visits Reported

LD0105002391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2115 GMT 30 Apr 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The trip by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, around the Kuzbass continues. He visited the West Siberian metallurgical combine and met the miners of prokopyevsk and kiselevsk. [video shows yeltsin smiling as he walks along a street with an entourage, miners talking, and bulldozers standing idle on heaps of coal]

[Begin correspondent N. Chirkov recording] On the way to the Artem House of Culture, where Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin today met the miners of striking enterprises, we visited the 26th CPSU Congress pit. It has been on strike since 12 March. It borrows money for wage packets from the bank. Where is it to get its own money if the pit is not dispatching any coal? People are tired, but the strike committee has decided to strike to the bitter end. I remembered that pit and other, similar ones, on more than one occasion, when Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin outlined his plan for transferring the oblast's coal enterprises to the jurisdiction of Russia. [video shows Yeltsin addressing a meeting]

The miners would not simply be exchanging one management department for another, but would be gaining complete economic independence, and a fund of social guarantees would be formed. But, that is tomorrow. How is one to live now? let's work out what the miners' strikes are costing Prokopyevsk and Kiselevsk alone. The debt for April amounts to 1.1 million tonnes. That is coke. Its extraction is profitable both to the pit and to the town. After all, most of the Kuzbass's budget comprises contributions from the open cast mine. However, no appeal to end the strike ensued. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin advised the miners to decide the problems for themselves. [video shows Yeltsin at an open-air meeting]

Similar tense and difficult work went on at all meeting with people, wherever they took place: in squares, in a wokers' club, or just in the street. In the evening, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin met the work force of the West Siberian metallurgical combine. [end recording]

Yeltsin-Kryuchkov Agreement on KGB Expected

PM3004123791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Item from a roundup of IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, POSTFAKTUM, INTERFAX, REUTER, UPI reports: "Russian KGB Being Formed"]

[Text] According to information received by an RIA correspondent from a reliable source, Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, will meet Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB [Committee for State Security], on 5 May. It is expected that a protocol on the formation of a Russian KGB will be signed during the meeting. This structure will be a Union-republic one.

It is believed that Major General Viktor Ivanenko will become acting chairman of the RSFSR KGB. He currently is deputy chief of the USSR KGB Inspection Directorate.

Further on Moscow Pro-Yeltsin Rally

LD3004112191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Apr 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A rally by the Democratic Russia Movement was held in Moscow this evening. Despite the rain, quite a few people, indeed a very large number, turned up.

[Correspondent A. Kraminov] Despite the awful weather, many people are here, several dozens of thousands. There is an air of elation. Yeltsin's supporters have no doubt about a victory for him, and they are most likely right. It is evident that in the current situation

Boris Nikolayevich's popularity stands extremely high, and the recent Congress of Russian People's Deputies was clear confirmation of that.

Even though extremist democrats have voiced dissatisfaction at Yeltsin having put his signature to the joint statement of eight other republican leaders and the country's president on measures to overcome the crisis, it seems to me that this was an important political demarche on Yeltsin's part. His opponents have thus been deprived of grounds for accusing the Russian leader of aspiring to strengthen his own power and weaken central authority by setting the republic against the Union.

At times this pre-election rally turned into a political one, including the reading of lists of deputies whom Boris Nikolayevich has dubbed traitors to democracy. And so the struggle for the Russian presidency is getting under way.

Prokofyev Hits Yeltsin's 'Fuehrer's' Ambitions

PM3004094191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 91 Second Edition p 7

[Unattributed "Our People About Us" report: "Opinion For Export"]

[Text] Soviet society is "on the verge of an explosion," Yuriy Prokofyev, leader of the Moscow party organization and an influential member of the Politburo, said in an interview for the paper THE BOSTON GLOBE.

Unless the leadership takes tough steps immediately, "plants and factories will shut down, there will be mass demonstrations, and, under pressure from the people, the president and government will be removed," Prokofyev warned.

"It is not a very nice picture, but I do not think I am exaggerating," he said, and added in passing that Prime Minister Pavlov should resign....

Gorbachev's position as president would not be directly threatened if Gorbachev were removed from the post of general secretary, but it would weaken even further his already shaky positions and might well encourage Gorbachev's conservative opponents in the legislature to redouble their efforts to remove him from the presidency.

Prokofyev said that Gorbachev can survive the plenum, starting on Wednesday, only if he presents at the plenum a "realistic and constructive" anticrisis program.

"It all depends on the position he adopts at the plenum," Prokofyev said. "If he tries to vindicate himself or say 'you are not working either,' I very much doubt whether he will remain general secretary," Prokofyev said.

The plenum participants can remove Gorbachev by a simple majority, Prokofyev said.

Prokofyev railed against Gorbachev and the people who worked with him at the radical stage of perestroyka, such as Aleksandr Yakovlev, who was Gorbachev's closest adviser during the years of radical reform, and former foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

"When the architects of perestroyka encountered difficulties after the first two years of perestroyka, they decided to destroy everything and start afresh," he said. "And switch to democracy straight away."

"The result of this was the destruction of the economy; we are no longer at the crisis stage, but at the disaster stage, and society is on the verge of an explosion." He was contemptuous of the way that Yakovlev, Shevardnadze, and others had faded into the background. Most observers believe that these people were forced to go. Prokofyev says that they were simply fleeing responsibility.

"I would not use the expression 'rats abandoning a sinking ship,' but it is something along those lines," he said.

Asked whether he thought Gorbachev should go, Prokofyev made it clear that he supports the Soviet leader only because there is no one to replace him with at the moment.

"He is indeed a tragic figure," Prokofyev said. "On the one hand, he no longer has the support of the people, and everyone curses him for causing his misfortunes. But, on the other hand, no one can name another candidate, particularly in view of the threat from Yeltsin, an unpredictable man, utterly bereft of democratic instincts, a man with a fuehrer's ambitions."

Russian Federation Marks May Day With Marches

LD0105083991 Moscow TASS in English 0831 GMT 1 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 1 TASS—Residents in Petropavlovsk Kamchatskiy were among the first to mark May Day in the Soviet Union. Braving cold weather and gusting wind, hundreds of families flocked to the city's Lenin Square. The march was spontaneous, although representatives of several large enterprises came with banners and slogans. Participants held a short impromptu rally near a monument to state founder Vladimir Lenin.

In Ulan Ude, the capital of the Buryat Republic, thousands of people gathered in Soviet Square by 1000 local time. Participants demanded that authorities take measures to protect people from the difficulties of the transition period. Slogans borne by marchers read "We Demand an End to the War of Laws," "Conscientious Work Will Change the Situation in the Country."

In Chita, marchers demanded immediate privatisation of state property, freedom to entrepreneurship and private land ownership. Other participants reiterated their

support for the socialist choice and called for the preservation of collective and state farms.

A resolution passed by the rally demanded an early introduction of a bill on wage indexation and the abolition of a five per cent sales tax.

Text of Law on RSFSR President Published

PM3004135591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

["RSFSR Law on the RSFSR President"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] Discharging the will of the people of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] as expressed in the first RSFSR referendum of 17 March 1991, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

Article 1. The RSFSR president is the supreme official of the RSFSR and the head of executive power in the RSFSR.

The RSFSR president cannot be a people's deputy.

During the period of the exercising of his powers, the RSFSR president suspends membership in political parties and public associations.

The RSFSR president does not occupy any other posts whatever in state and public organs and organizations.

Article 2. Only a citizen of the RSFSR no younger than 35 years or older than 65 years who enjoys the right to vote can be elected president of the RSFSR.

The RSFSR president is elected for a term of five years. The same person cannot be RSFSR president for more than two consecutive terms.

Article 3. The RSFSR president is elected by RSFSR citizens by secret ballot on the basis of universal, equal, and direct suffrage.

No other election or appointment to the post of RSFSR president nor conferment of the powers of the RSFSR president is lawful or valid.

The procedure for the election and inauguration of the RSFSR president is laid down by RSFSR laws.

Article 4. On taking office the RSFSR president swears the following oath:

"In exercising the powers of RSFSR president I swear to observe the RSFSR's Constitution and laws, to defend its sovereignty, to respect and protect human and civil rights and liberties and the rights of the RSFSR's people, and to conscientiously carry out the duties placed upon me."

Article 5. The RSFSR president:

1) Enjoys the right of legislative intitiative;

2) Signs and publishes RSFSR laws within 14 days of their adoption.

Laws adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet can be returned by the RSFSR president for reexamination before the expiry of this period. If on reexamination the RSFSR law is adopted by a majority of votes of the total membership of each chamber of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR president must sign and publish it within three days;

3) Presents at least once a year reports to the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies on the fulfilment of socioeconomic and other programs adopted by the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and on the situation in the RSFSR and sends messages to the people of the RSFSR, the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies is entitled by a majority of votes of the total number of RSFSR people's deputies to demand an ahead-of-schedule report from the RSFSR president;

4) appoints the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's assent;

5) Appoints and releases from duty the ministers and leaders of RSFSR committees and departments at the submission of the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers;

6) Directs the activity of the RSFSR Council of Ministers;

7) Accepts the resignation of the RSFSR Government with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's assent;

8) Appoints and recalls RSFSR diplomatic representatives and accepts the credentials and letters of recall of diplomatic representatives accredited to it;

9) Heads the RSFSR Security Council, whose structure, powers, and formation procedure are laid down by RSFSR law;

10) Conducts talks and on behalf of the RSFSR, signs international and interrepublic treaties which enter into effect after ratification by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet;

11) Adopts measures to ensure the state and public security of the RSFSR and participates in ensuring the state and public security of the USSR on behalf of the RSFSR;

Extraordinary sittings of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and extraordinary sessions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet are convened at the proposal of the RSFSR president.

The RSFSR president does not have the right to dissolve or suspend the activity of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies or the RSFSR Supreme Soviet;

12) Declares a state of emergency in accordance with RSFSR law. On the territory of a republic forming part

of the RSFSR, a state of emergency is declared by agreement with its supreme organs of state power;

13) Resolves questions of RSFSR citizenship and the granting of political asylum in accordance with the law;

14) Presents state awards of the RSFSR and confers special titles, class ranks, and titles of honor of the RSFSR;

15) Exercises the right to pardon citizens convicted by RSFSR courts;

16) Exercises other powers vested in him by the RSFSR Constitution and laws.

Article 6. The powers of the RSFSR president cannot be used to alter the RSFSR national state structure or to dissolve or suspend the activity of any lawfully elected organ of state power.

Article 7. The RSFSR vice president is elected simultaneously with the RSFSR president. An RSFSR presidential candidate may propose an RSFSR vice presidential candidate.

An RSFSR citizen no younger than 35 years or older than 65 years who enjoys the right to vote can be elected RSFSR vice president.

During the exercise of his powers the RSFSR vice president suspends his membership in political parties and public associations.

The RSFSR vice president cannot be a people's deputy.

The RSFSR vice president exercises his individual powers on the the RSFSR president's instruction.

The RSFSR vice president deputizes for the RSFSR president in the latter's absence.

Article 8. The RSFSR president issues decrees and instructions and verifies their execution on the basis and in fulfillment of the Constitution and the laws of the RSFSR and the decisions of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The RSFSR president's decrees may not run counter to the Constitution and laws of the RSFSR. The RSFSR president's decrees must be carried out throughout the territory of the RSFSR.

The Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies or the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is entitled on the basis of the ruling of the RSFSR Constitutional Court to repeal RSFSR presidential decrees if they are at variance with the RSFSR Constitution and laws and the decisions of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies and RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

The RSFSR president is entitled to suspend the decisions of organs of executive power on the territory of the RSFSR if they are at variance with the RSFSR Constitution and laws and to remove officials of those organs from the exercise of their duties if they are in breach of RSFSR legislation.

Article 9. The person of the RSFSR president is inviolable and protected by law.

Article 10. The RSFSR president can be dismissed from office on violation of the RSFSR Constitution and laws or his sworn oath.

Such a decision is made by the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies on the basis of the ruling of the RSFSR Constitutional Court by a majority of two-thirds of the total number of RSFSR people's deputies on the initiative of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, or one of its chambers.

Article 11. In the event of the removal of the RSFSR president from office, the resignation of the RSFSR president, or the impossibility of the further exercise of his powers, or in the event of the death of the RSFSR president, the powers of the RSFSR president are exercised by the RSFSR vice president.

The question of setting RSFSR presidential elections is resolved in accordance with the RSFSR Law "On the Election of the RSFSR President."

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

RSFSR House of the Soviets, Moscow, 24 April 1991.

Six Candidates Nominated

LD3004135491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1315 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Apr (TASS)—Six candidates for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] presidency have already been nominated by various sociopolitical organizations and labor collectives. Candidate number one may be said to be Boris Yeltsin. After him come Aleksey Sergeyev, leader of the United Front of Working People; Vadim Bakatin, member of the USSR Security Council; Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, leader of the Liberal Party; Vladimir Voronin, chairman of the Centrist Bloc of political parties; and Leonid Ubozhko, head of the Conservative Party.

In connection with the start of the election campaign, Vasiliy Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission for RSFSR presidential elections, told TASS that meetings between the candidates for the RSFSR presidency will be held from the day the candidates are registered until 11 June. This provision, it is true, will not affect those candidates who have been nominated by political parties, trade unions, or mass sociopolitical movements but who failed to get the backing of one-fifth of the RSFSR people's deputies.

Ryzhkov Prepared To Run

LD0105081991 Moscow TASS in English 0814 GMT 1 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 1 TASS—Former Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, who quit his post several months ago after a heart attack, has said he is willing to run for the Russian Presidency.

Ryzhkov told the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper he had been approached by representatives of workers seeking to nominate him for the post.

"If I am accorded this great honour and nominated for the presidency, I am prepared to run," Ryzhkov told the newspaper.

"As a citizen, I cannot stay aside of active political life. There was an illness, but it has passed," Ryzhkov said.

Polozkov Welcomes Trend of Recent Events

PM3004081591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with I.K. Polozkov by unnamed correspondent; date and place not given: "The Starting Point for Actions"]

[Text] [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] Ivan Kuzmich, last week attention was focused on several important political events, including the CPSU Central Committee plenum. In your opinion, how will they affect the development of the situation in the country, will they help it to stabilize, and will they reduce social tension? Or will they do the opposite and increase the disorder in society?

[Polozkov] Indeed, the past few days have been full of important events. These include the end of the USSR president's trip to Japan, the examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet of the government program for getting out of the crisis, the joint statement by the president and the leaders of nine Union republics, the discussion of important draft laws in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and the CPSU Central Committee plenum, which undoubtedly provoked particular interest. To my mind, all these events should have a positive influence on the social climate. If the decisions adopted are bolstered by active organizational work at both Union and republic level, then we can hope for the gradual normalization of the situation in the country and the rapprochement of all forces that are interested in overcoming the crisis.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] How would you comment on the results of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum?

[Polozkov] The plenum was by no means ordinary. It is difficult to interpret its whole significance straight away; it deserves serious, deep analysis. But it is already clear now that the plenum was a strong impetus for the activization of work in all party components. The party's reaction to the program for getting out of the crisis proposed by Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov was determined and the main directions of the activity of party organizations to stabilize the situation in society and link all democratic progressive forces were discussed. I think that the plenum will become a good starting point for new initiative actions by the party and the strengthening of the unity of its ranks.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA] And how do you assess the "agreement of the nine?"

[Polozkov] I think it is very significant. It cannot fail to raise hopes that the leadership of the nine republics—among whom differences of opinion on certain important questions have recently appeared—have been able to find a common language. I would say that this is the beginning of the cohesion of the Union and the revival of its strength on a renewed basis. And I would particularly like to note that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, along with other leaders, signed the joint documents at the negotiating table. He has shown that he is able to rise above personal interests, act with foresight, and occupy constructive positions that meet the interests of Russia and the Russians.

Democratic Party 'Differences' Viewed

LD3004092191 Moscow TASS in English 0904 GMT 30 Apr 91

[By TASS World Service analyst Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS—Realism or extremism is the choice facing Russia's movement that unite a considerable part of forces opposing the Soviet Communist Party.

A two-day plenum of the Council of Representatives of the Democratic Russia movement, which ended on Sunday, and congresses of the democratic and social-democratic parties have shown that the opposition is approaching the forthcoming Russian presidential election in disarray.

At the congress of the Democratic Party of Russia, led by Nikolay Travkin, two of its other leaders—Garriy Kasparov and Arkadiy Murashev—and about 100 of their supporters quit the party demonstratively.

Arkadiy Murashev summed up the differences at the Democratic Russia plenum: "We left the Democratic Party of Russia because it actually renounced proclaimed anti-communist policies."

Radical Democratic Russia leaders were also dismayed that three other parties in the movement—the Democratic Party of Russia, the Russian Christian Democratic Movement and the Constitutional-Democratic Party—formed the "Constructive-Democratic Bloc-National Accord" alliance for the elections.

The bloc's declaration renounces "left and right radicalism and all types of political extremism".

Yuriy Afanasyev, one of Democratic Russia's leaders, blasted such actions as "sabotage" and an attempt to split the ranks.

According to him, the refusal by several leaders, including Nikolay Travkin and Boris Yeltsin, to continue to demand Gorbachev's resignation "largely disoriented the democratic movement".

Many welcomed a joint statement on measures to pull the country out of crisis by Gorbachev and leaders of nine Soviet republics, including Boris Yeltsin, as a stabilising factor.

However, the most radical Democratic Russia leaders were dismayed by what they called Yeltsin's "concession" to Gorbachev.

Law on Rehabilitating Repressed Nations Adopted

PM0105114391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[I. Yelistratov report: "Law Adopted to Applause"]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has adopted a Law on Rehabilitating Repressed Peoples, which will come into force as soon as it is published.

A rare event in this hall—deputies and guests embraced, congratulated each other, and applauded. The law was adopted. It marks the restoration of justice and the flouted rights of people who for years have in fact been ranked as "second class" citizens.

A.A. Malsagov, deputy chairman of the Chechen-Ingush Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, said: "This is a real holiday for us. I think that the law erases the tension in our region and decreases the likelihood of interethnic conflicts, although this risk remains high."

The theme's sensitivity prompted the Supreme Soviet to shy away from a live broadcast—one word uttered inadvertently in the heat of the moment could cause offense "in the localities." Even the text of the law itself refrains from naming the nations and peoples who suffered as a result of state lawlessness—it bears the character of a general political document.

The law clearly establishes guidelines for the territorial rehabilitation of peoples which envisage legal and organizational measures for their return to traditional places of residence on the basis of the peoples' stated will.

It was established that any damage caused to people and citizens will be compensated. Of course, this is not a simple matter, especially in the current economic situation. Expert assessments estimate that approximately 40 billion rubles will be needed for the rehabilitation measures (this figure was quoted during the discussion). The social and cultural rehabilitation of citizens presupposes a pension increase and triple length-of-service credits (three years for one) for time spent in special settlements (places of exile). No less important is the clause whereby all peoples will be entitled to restore the historical names of cities, villages, and localities.

During the discussion on the draft law, the question of political rehabilitation for Cossacks also arose. B.N. Yeltsin proposed that the matter be deferred until September.

The session was presented with a draft law on social protection for citizens subjected to the effects of radiation as a result of the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station catastrophe.

Western Republics

Malofeyev on Belorussian Strike Report

914F0197A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 24 Apr pp 1, 2

[Report on interview with A.A. Malofeyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA special correspondents Victor Dyunin and Vasiliy Roshchin: "A Thunderstorm in April"]

[Text] Minsk—*I met with Anatoliy Malofeyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, after the events of 3-10 April connected with the workers' strikes at plants in Minsk and in other cities of the republic. The central press devoted a lot of attention to them as it emphasized the "unexpected" character of the social explosion in a republic which was until now considered rather calm and safe. Nevertheless, could the Belorussian leadership have anticipated a situation in which the workers would go into the streets and squares, enraged by an all-out price increase (and not by the reform per se, because everybody was inwardly ready for it)?*

"What happened was not very unexpected for me," said Anatoliy Aleksandrovich. " If the wave of strikes had not come at the beginning of April, it would have come at the end of the month because of the sad anniversary of the Chernobyl tragedy. The price reform, with its current degree of rigidity, proved an accelerating agent. It would have been naive not to foresee any disturbances among workers. But I have to admit honestly that we never expected such intensity and scope to the strike movement.

"Do not try to find some specific reasons for the disturbances in our republic in everything else. The reasons are common for all of us. We all live in a single economic sphere. Everything that is happening in the country happens here also, with some difference in time.

"Why the delay? Because by hook or crook our republic has stayed afloat so far. We did not allow production volumes to drop, meat and milk were present on our store shelves. We still have these products. But a certain

deterioration of life has taken place in recent years. The consumer market has been falling apart, the cup of people's patience has been overflowing. The fact that, in spite of government promises to increase prices some 1.6-1.7 times on average, they were tripled or even quadrupled for some goods and foods became that very last drop in the cup of people's patience and this caused the wave of strikes."

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] There are attempts to explain all this by the state of a shock felt by the worker when he had to pay three rubles [R] for what used to be a R1 lunch. Considering that this indignation was caused, if we may say so, primarily by problems of everyday life, the strikes could have been prevented with the help of various additional payments and compensations. Can it be that the government, enterprise managers, and party committees were simply not ready for them and they failed to take preventive measures?

[Malofeyev] Yes, to a certain extent it can. But the prices were set by the Union Government and not by our republic. Besides, it was all done in a hurry. We received some of the price lists three days before 2 April. It seemed that somebody intentionally tried not to leave us any time. We had to urgently find additional sources to make it possible to lower prices in school, college, and workers' cafeterias, to lower prices on children's goods, to provide social protection for retirees, the disabled, students, and other low-income population groups. We needed a lot of money for this and where could we find it, given the huge deficit in the republic budget? But now we can say, however, that we resolved as many issues from the package of the strikers' economic demands as we could.

But now the strike committees are putting political goals at the top of their list. They demand the resignation of the country's president, dissolution of the USSR Congress and of the Union and republic Supreme Soviets. There are also issues connected with depoliticization and departyization, with removal of party committees from the territories of enterprises. There is nothing new in this. Because nature abhors a vacuum, opposition parties are starting to set up their own structures at enterprises while they demand that the "CPSU be thrown out."

Any unhappiness among the people, any deterioration of their financial situation—all of it is being used to destabilize the political situation in our region also. It seems to displease some people that Belorussia is not in such a mess yet as other parts of the country. That means it needs to be "helped." Envoys are coming from the miners, from the Baltics, from Moscow, and from other high tension areas. Our own members of the People's Front and of the Democratic Party have become more active. Everything is being done to push the republic into the abyss of a prolonged political strike. They are not thinking now how to get out of it later.

Most of the officials of our Central Committee are now with the workers. We are trying to persuade people that a strike is not the method we need to employ.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] What is the situation like in the villages?

[Malofeyev] The same thing that happened to the consumer market can happen to the village. So far we have been trying to preserve our political influence there to impede the drop in production which has already started. Milk production dropped by about 10 percent, for instance. There is an increased demand for dairy products linked to the hike in meat prices. Consumption of bread is going up too. We will try to do all we can. We are being criticized though: They say that the party is interfering in the economy again. But this is not serious. If we do not resolve all village-related issues today, there will be immense problems with food supplies.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] But let us return to the strike committees, Anatoliy Aleksandrovich. Calls are heard at the rallies not to allow Communists in the strike committees. Even though many of them support reasonable economic and even some political demands, but without going to extremes.

[Malofeyev] Those who strive to achieve their political goals through the workers' movement are presenting the following condition: Do not allow any Communists among you. Not only Communists, but also trade union activists, or any normal people in general. So that nobody will prevent them from conducting their own policy. That is the way things are at the tractor plant, the automobile plant, and others. It is not accidental that the strike committees insist on removing Communist Party primary organizations from the territories of enterprises. Meanwhile, there is not a single informal movement, not a single new party that wants to undertake responsibility for and care of the people's immediate needs. The main thing for such people is to aggravate the situation, to exacerbate the tensions, to go overboard sometimes, and blame Communists for everything.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Could the party organization of the republic or, say, separate party committees disassociate themselves from the overly precarious character of the reform? Could they speak against a price hike which requires immediate additional compensations? Maybe the Communists could have gained some confidence?

[Malofeyev] No, they could not. We would have found ourselves in isolation, trying to gain some cheap popularity. There exists the objective reality: The price increase was caused by the state of the economy into which it arrived. This is quite unequivocal. The party had everything to do with it. Whatever we might try to say now, this unpopular measure was inevitable and the CPSU should not try to evade responsibility for it. That would be populistic. Such a step could not change the situation in the country but the tensions in our society would intensify from it. Who would have listened to us,

anyway? The decision was taken by the Council of the Federation, by plenipotentiary individuals, by the legislature of the country.

No, we cannot play our political cards using the difficult situation that faces our society. It is a different matter that prices for some goods should not have grown in such proportions. That should have been reconsidered.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] It seems that the confidence crisis has reached its climax with respect to the latest reforms which so far have failed to improve the people's life. Now we need some more decisive actions, maybe extraordinary ones, undertaken by the party leadership....

[Malofeyev] All the events of perestroyka are still fresh in my memory. At the end of March 1985 I became the first secretary of the Minsk Belorussian Communist Party Obkom [oblast committee]. Everything was going well. Perestroyka was being accepted and supported by the majority of our population. People started to be appreciated for their talents, we were getting rid of those who did nothing. New democratic forms, organizations, and societies emerged which were not then polluted yet by anyone or by anything. But later, after mid 1988, events occurred that made perestroyka and the CPSU itself deviate from their original course. Then we found ourselves in a most difficult situation. The party has become a source of powerful social tensions. All speeches about the need to start with ourselves instead of making recommendations and giving out prescriptions remained just speeches. It seems, however, that we had a program and we also had some ideas about how to implement it. Some people are still saying: Let us democratize our party. But in what way, tell us? On what basis?

I would say more. The Communist Party does not have to fulfill the opposition's social order with its own hands. It is still strong, it is still influential. As long as its purpose is the socialist choice, it will be opposed by an anti-Communist force. There is no third alternative in this. We should not live with the illusion of having a multi-party system or having new structures that speak only against Communists. They are not talking about the removal of the CPSU only from the political arena, they also mean a change of the constitutional structure.

[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA] Anatoliy Aleksandrovich, what do you think about the idea to call an extraordinary CPSU congress, as early as June?

[Malofeyev] That is adventurism. What is the point? A report from the leadership? A change of leadership? This can be done at a plenum. We need to start to really fulfill all the decisions that have been already passed.

AS THIS ISSUE WAS BEING SET FOR PRINTING

Answering the call of the city strike committee, thousands of Minsk workers again came to the square in front of the republic government building. The rally participants demanded an extraordinary session of the Belorussia Supreme Soviet, they wanted the issues of departyization and depoliticization to be put on the agenda; they wanted a law passed allowing elections on a multi-party basis.

Youth Paper Interviews Ukraine's Kravchuk

PM3004115991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 91 p 2

[Interview in Kiev with Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk by correspondent O. Musafirova; date not given: "Leonid Kravchuk: Thus, What We Have Before us is Not Democracy But Something Different...."]

[Excerpt] Kiev—[passage omitted] "The biggest political mystery in the Ukraine today is the person of its leader—Leonid Kravchuk, head of the legislature. Is he the same Leonid Kravchuk who patiently made his way up in the apparatus of the orthodox Ukrainian Communist Party and became its political leader? Or is he a closet Ukrainian nationalist, whose true feelings are beginning to come to light today?

"Mr. Kravchuk offers a third answer: He is an example of the new politician in the Soviet Union, who seeks to express the interests of his voters." (From an article in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, Boston, the United States).

[Musafirova] ...Your office decor, Leonid Makarovich, has been chosen with great taste. Did you change it when you arrived, or did you inherit everything in this form from the previous tenants?

[Kravchuk] I took down the portraits. There were very many portraits on the walls, and it was impossible to get right into the office: an iconostasis. I left only Lenin.

In principle a work room must be small and cozy—it is not a place for receptions but to write and think. But everything is so complex now that it is inconceivable to undertake any repairs or rearrangements, even in the direction of making things more "modest." And I am not doing this.

[Musafirova] Please tell me about Lenin—is this out of conviction?

[Kravchuk] I have had two opportunities to study Lenin. First as a student of Kiev University's Department of Political Economy, then three years at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences. I wrote a dissertation, and I had to reread Lenin in order to form an impression of him as a man, a politician, a philosopher, and a sociologist.

I am convinced that he is a major figure in history. If it had not been for the Leninist theory worked out prior to 1917, much of what was happening in the workers movement in the West would not have been realized. But then came the revolution and power. Lenin was in power. What was he to do? Remain a humanist and theorist or defend what had already been achieved? He

chose the second course. And then the formula "please be so good as to take your rifle, stand by the entrance, I beg you, and as far as possible keep the enemy out of the building" became irrelevant. Just so.

I do not idolize Lenin. But I always address him respectfully.

[Musafirova] Did you find it easy to get here?

[Kravchuk] It all happened unexpectedly. Although I would not say that it was entirely unexpected.

Ivashko was elected Supreme Soviet chairman. Suddenly Vladimir Antonovich resigned, and there was a situation which I would not like to comment on again.... In general, another round of nomination of contenders—27 people, including myself. I was not elected the first time around, being two votes short. There were four of us left in the marathon.

The legislative majority, above all, took a negative view of Ivashko's departure. The opposition also used the opportunity to emphasize: See what kind of CPSU members they are! At a difficult time they abandon the Ukraine! Kravchuk, it was said, is of the same ilk. Is it really possible to trust him, i.e. me? My candidacy was nominated by the Communist majority in the Supreme Soviet. [Kravchuk ends]

...They were days when the Kiev militia, cordoned off, was dying of laughter. I do not know to what extent such a thing is permitted "on duty." It is probably not encouraged. But the guys, who had been urgently assembled from all oblasts, crammed into buses and trucks, and stationed by every sapling in the public garden outside the Supreme Soviet and in several rows in the street (were they expecting the masses to mount an assault?), had to watch a show with the code name "Funeral of the 'Head.'" Wreaths were carried to the Dnepr and lowered onto the water with wishes that they float right to Moscow.

Ivashko's departure was explained to the deputies as resulting from resentment—he could not stand the pressure of rallies—and from alarm at the fate of the Communist Party at a complex and contradictory time. The post of deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee strengthened the party's positions. According to rumors, Ivashko pushed his seat in the legislature precisely over to Kravchuk. A quite well-known party worker, the "godfather" of whose popularity was Rukh, which at that time, in 1989, still needed to have its name deciphered—the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka.

At its second congress a year later, just as Kravchuk had predicted, the fully formed Rukh cut off the tail of its full name, declaring that it would take a different path. Enemy deputies, heroes of hours-long television debates, met in the legislature: Leonid Kravchuk of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Ivan Drach and Dmitro Pavlychko of Rukh, and many others.

[Kravchuk resumes] ...Of course, I doubted the possibility of being elected. I knew that the People's Council would not vote for a Central Committee secretary, for an ideologue opposed to Rukh. Although our very first meeting showed that the movement was heterogeneous, and you cannot conclude that that is bad. But, in a situation when very rigid party discipline existed and I was only head of a Central Committee department, I could not fail to fulfill the Central Committee's directives.

True, at the second stage of the debate, I tried to present those directives more indulgently, without prohibitions or excessive categoricalness. But certain Rukh figures continued attacking, dissembling, etc. So I knew the actual distribution of forces and did not hold out very much hope. That was why I reacted calmly. I was even asked: Why are you so calm? If a person selects a target and takes a long time approaching it, then, of course, the thought of defeat worries and irritates him. But in my case everything was decided in two days....

[Musafirova] Do you often change your views and convictions? What can make you revise them?

[Kravchuk] In order to change your views, you need inner readiness for this, at least. There are people who are incapable in principle of such a process. They consider this a loss of their own "self," of their own person. I think differently. On the contrary, a person who changes his viewpoint depending on changes in life goes up in the estimation of those around him, as they look on him as a realist.

Now my attitude to sovereignty, let us say. I will not pretend that I have always held my present position. Or my view of Rukh....

[Musafirova] Obviously this provokes criticism from the "incapable" ones you mentioned, criticism which is being leveled at you increasingly frequently by the leadership of the Ukrainian Communist Party and the legislative majority, does it not?

[Kravchuk] There is criticism in two main areas. The first is fundamental. I am sure that the Ukraine must be a sovereign, full-blooded, full-fledged state. And I do not hide this from the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, the Politburo, or the CPSU Central Committee plenum, either at home or in the Supreme Soviet. I can see that this approach does not please everyone. Many people adhere to the viewpoint that the prospect for the Ukraine is as a renewed federal state, where some of the powers have been transferred—or it would be more accurate to say left—to the republics.

Let us stick to the logic of the order of things, as the ancients would say. Perestroyka, 1985. People announce that we have democracy, glasnost, and pluralism. But, as is known, the core of democracy is the right of the nation, the people, to self-determination. Consequently, democracy cannot establish a framework: Look, you

have been permitted to speak Ukrainian, there is something else, and that is enough. But as soon as the talk turns to power and the right of the master, they say: Oh, that is superfluous, there is no need for that. Thus, what we have before us is not democracy but something different....

Opponents maintain: We are not yet mature enough for our own power and do not have the conditions or the potential. They intimidate us by saying that the Ukraine will become colonial and dependent. Little Albania has not, but we certainly will....

It is not a question of building a continuous fence around a sovereign state but of integrating with other countries on the basis of sovereignty. Russia, Belorussia, Kazakhstan—what prevents us from uniting on just principles not to buy gas, timber, and cotton for currency? And not confining ourselves to internal contacts but going out to Europe? But, as I have realized, these theses are not dear to everyone.

The second reason for criticism is human. Many of my colleagues, so to speak, want me today, as Supreme Soviet chairman, to give constant support to the majority alone and to blacken the opposition. When I act this way, I hear applause and feel support. But I am chairman of the Supreme Soviet, not a Central Committee secretary! I do not want to support Communists alone in the legislature, for they are not always right, incidentally. Likewise I cannot support the opposition, because it is very often not right.

Many people cannot part with the illusion that they are participating not in the work of a session but in the work of a party plenum.... They demand a corresponding attitude. "Ingratiating!" is the most popular accusation. I particularly got it before the referendum, when there was talk of a second ballot. I felt overt rejection, since the leaders of the Ukrainian Communist Party were opposed to a republic poll. But I was convinced that, if there was not a second ballot, there would not be the first, Union one either. There would be a wave of rallies and strikes against the "imperial center." But we ruled out tension by granting an opportunity to speak up for life in the Union but on the principles of sovereignty.

It seems to me that many Communists, both then and now, did not understand this. They ask: How is it that you, a Politburo member and former ideologue, do not observe disciplinary, regulation principles? It takes time for them to see the light. So I react very calmly.

I sat in on Politburo sessions for 15 years, excluding vacations of course. I see such people in the hall, I see their eyes—they remain children of their epoch. And they cannot surmount the psychological barrier. [Kravchuk ends]

"The democratic processes in Galicia are increasingly attracting attention in the republic, the country, and abroad. When has it happened that all the republic's first leaders at once have visited Lvov Oblast in the space of two months!

"...Now Supreme Soviet Chairman L.M. Kravchuk has spent two days in the ancient city. Could the republic's party ideologue have presumed in the recent past that the 'center of Ukrainian extremism' would give him such a human welcome? Probably not. The people of Lvov at once sensed changes (albeit insignificant ones) in the chairman's tactic and behavior during recent sittings of the legislature and decided in advance to thank him for his desire to take a more constructive stand, doing so when they took to the streets of Lvov and gave him a cordial welcome.

"...Summing up the results of his visit for workers of the press, the Supreme Soviet chairman once again spoke approvingly of the democratic processes taking place in Galicia and emphasized that the Ukraine continues to try to secure the right to be an independent state.

"In order to strengthen him still further in these convictions, V. Shpitser, chairman of Lvov City Soviet, presented Leonid Kravchuk with a hetman's symbolic crystal mace. Suppose he takes his cue from us and becomes one, for the Ukraine has always been led by a hetman...." (From press release No. 8 of Lvov Oblast Soviet, February 1991).

[Musafirova] Society's temperature has reached boiling point. While I am talking with you, a days-long rally, a harbinger of a strike, is continuing in October Revolution Square, miners are being replaced by shipbuilders, and shipbuilders by students. They are demanding the resignation of the president and the USSR Supreme Soviet and the dissolution of the Congress of People's Deputies. The Ukrainian legislature is mentioned somewhat more rarely in this context, but the people's irritation is great, and it is hard to make forecasts. Leonid Makarovich, are thoughts of resignation not your thoughts?

[Kravchuk] I do not consider myself irreplaceable. But if I leave today, this will mean a crisis and the probable end of the Supreme Soviet's present composition. Some of the deputies who have faith in me will lose support. Those who disagree will find confirmation of their rightness. The dissolution of the legislature would complete the chaos. Some 53 million people would bestir themselves and march against one another.... When I think about this, I override my own nerve cells, the grievances and insults. I am obliged to stay with people. If we stand firm, the legislature will be remembered in history, whatever labels are stuck to it now. People will say: At a very difficult time they resolved two tasks—they prevented bloodshed and opened the way to sovereignty. They did not build a sovereign state—which takes years and years. But our grandchildren will remember: They showed wisdom and achieved the main thing.

[Musafirova] Do you have a dependable support network?

[Kravchuk] What do you mean?

[Musafirova] What you yourself consider to be your support network.

[Kravchuk] I have a normal family. My wife is a university teacher, also a political economist and a candidate of sciences. My son, his wife, two grandchildren—thank god, as the saying goes, I have no great complaints against them. They are not an embarrassment to me—which could be used, given the chance, by those who try to wound me: What children, they would say! Leaders' children are always in the public eye, and many of them really do become spoiled. Privileged living conditions and lack of control. Bah, there is none of that here.

My son is studying laser physics, and my daughter-in-law is a journalist and a very good mother and has also found time to defend a dissertation. I was surprised she managed it....

As for my rating, which is growing.... The people can create a leader in one day and at once trample on him....

[Musafirova] What do you think, Leonid Makarovich? To what extent does your character coincide with the characteristic features of the Ukrainian people?

[Kravchuk] I express the interests of not only Ukrainians but also Russians, Jews, Bulgarians, Hungarians, and Romanians who live on Ukrainian soil. So you cannot single out just one feature here. What is also important is competence and the ability, as Lenin said, to "live among the masses." And outward attractiveness. I do not mean just a pleasant, handsome person but someone perceived as such. I receive masses of different letters, including from women. They write: I would listen and watch for hours when you address the session.... (He laughs).

Kravchuk Favorably Assesses Bavaria Visit

LD3004182291 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] A delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet headed by Leonid Kravchuk, has finished its visit to Bavaria, Germany. In his interview for the UKRAINIAN NEWS AGENCY the head of the Ukrainian parliament evaluated this visit as useful and fruitful. Both sides have signed a communique. The document reveals mutual wish to develop cooperation between Ukraine and Bavaria. The priority under these conditions is given to direct contacts between industrial enterprises, local bodies of power in the realization of economic, scientific, and educational programs. The communique also reads that Ukraine is striving as quickly as possible to integrate into the world economic system, and the declaration on state and economic sovereignty will allow the republic to do this. Tomorrow Leonid Kravchuk, head of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, will take part in news conference on the results of his visit.

Rukh Leader Discusses Union Treaty, Commonwealth

LD3004152791 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 29 Apr 91

[Interview with Ukrainian People's Deputy Ivan Drach, leader of Rukh, by correspondent Serhiy Hubin, from the Radio Kiev series of talks under the rubric "The Union Treaty—What Should It Be Like?;" place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Hubin] Ivan Fedorovich, Rukh is a multifaceted organization. It consists of many political organizations and groups. What is their attitude toward the Union treaty? Are there any differences?

[Drach] All components are generally united by their wish to fight for a sovereign and independent Ukraine. However, they differ on how to achieve this. Some believe it would be possible for the Ukraine to enter a commonwealth of states. There are forces who oppose such an alliance. They maintain that the Ukraine must be sovereign and independent.

Officially, Rukh has entered the Democratic Congress in Moscow. As you know, a consultative conference of this congress was held in Moscow for several days. We also attended the interlegislative conference of all democratic factions existing in the legislatures of the Union and supported the creation of a commonwealth of states.

[Hubin] How do you visualize this commonwealth?

[Drach] We see it only as a consultative organ for meetings between sovereign states, not as a single unitary state headed by a commonly elected president or single Supreme Soviet or one constitution. In our view, the main state prerogatives should be preserved only in republics, only in sovereign states. In no way do we contemplate creating single superstate similiar to the former USSR that still exists now.

[Hubin] How will this commonwealth be ruled? When created, it has to function somehow.

[Drach] We visualize a transitional stage until sovereign and independent states come into being. This will be a period of dismantling the empire that is called the USSR. A temporary consultative council will be created for this period, whose task will be to assist in strengthening the statehood of all components of this commonwealth.

[Hubin] In your view, who will be part of this consultative council? High officials of the new sovereign states? What about the economy?

[Drach] The components will also create an economic council. Representatives of the Party of Democratic Revival of the Ukraine were very actively engaged in

working out this draft. [passage omitted] All economic relations between the parties will be pursued only in a horizontal plane.

[Hubin] For how long will this dismantling process last?

[Drach] Even King Solomon could not answer this question. I expect that there will be serious opposition to this scheme. No matter how you look at it, the majority of people favor a commonwealth of states instead of the Union treaty proposed by Gorbachev.

UN Official Examines Chernobyl Problems

PM3004091991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Chernobyl—Common Pain"]

[Text] Kiev, 26 Apr—Margaret Anstey, deputy UN secretary general and UN coordinator for questions of overcoming the aftermath of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station, has paid a two-day visit to Kiev at the invitation of the Ukrainian Government.

"The UN countries' unanimous adoption of a resolution on Chernobyl," Anstey said, "illustrates the attention paid by the world community to this tragedy. This unity of opinions represents recognition that the catastrophe crossed national borders and affects the vital interests of millions of people not only in the Soviet Union."

This resolution aroused great expectations and hopes. But the difficulties that are to be encountered should be taken into consideration. They include the United Nations' lack of funds and specialists' diverse views of ways to resolve Chernobyl's problems. Nor must one forget that in the five years since the accident the acuteness of the world public's perception of the catastrophe has decreased. Under these conditions a carefully coordinated action plan must be worked out for all organizations interested in solving this problem, including nongovernmental organizations. This plan should be submitted for consideration to the UN General Assembly this fall.

M. Anstey noted that the visit has enabled her to gain a deeper understanding of the scale of the consequences of the Chernobyl catastrophe. In our future work we will fully take into consideration what we have seen and heard in the Ukraine, she stressed.

24 Apr Ukrainian Legislature Session Detailed

LD2604101791 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 24 Apr 91

[Report on 24 April Ukranian Supreme Soviet proceedings in Kiev by correspondent Mykola Marynenko]

[Summary] Today's Supreme Soviet sitting started with a discussion of road-building in the Ukraine. Deputies pointed to the fact that such a highly industrialized republic as the Ukraine greatly lags behind other parts of the USSR concerning the density of hard-surface roads per capita. It holds eighth place in the USSR and looks even poorer compared with Europe. Because of the insufficient availability of motor roads, Ukraine's economy wastes 2 billion rubles [R] a year.

After the lunch break, the legislature went over to discussing the introduction of new retail prices. Oleksander Moroz, leader of the Communist majority, made a statement to the effect that the "Group-239" does not share the cavalier attitude of the all-Union Government to the price reform. Uneasiness is evoked by the lack of a clear-cut and comprehensive state program for getting out of the economic crisis and also by the passivity, inconsistency, and indecision on the part of the all-Union authorities and the president himself. One should always keep in mind that the situation in the Ukraine is becoming more acute because of the consequences of Chernobyl. The legislative majority, he stated, urges the republican government to devise a more workable mechanism for protecting the interests of working people and their families.

Oleksander Moroz called on all legislative to seek ways toward close cooperation in order to overcome the crisis in the Ukraine and stabilize the political situation.

The Narodna Rada faction was prepared to answer the call with a similiar gesture. Its spokesman, Arsen Zinchenko, delivered the following statement:

"This spring has finally bared all the shortcomings of the existing sociopolitical system. This April will enter the chronicle as a yet another deception on the part of the Union Government which, while allegedly going over to market conditions, has caused a criminal and plundering three-fold increase in prices. This has catastropically lowered the living standard of the people.

"The main mechanisms for plundering the people were worked out in Moscow. However, the Government of the Ukraine did not take specific steps to stop the colonial exploitation of the republic. In this complicated situation it is quite natural that miners come out in social and political protest as do metal workers and students. Even today our government remains a vassal executing the center's will. Up until now no specific measures have been taken regarding compensating for the jump of prices and to protecting people.

"The opposition has repeatedly warned and called to get rid of this sitting-on-the-fence position and begin a radical political and economic reform. We propose to solve immediately the following questions: First, to change the politcal status of the Ukraine and declare its state independence; second, to nationalize Union-owned property; third, in accordance with the price rises, to treble wages, pensions, and students' grants; next, to adopt a bill on citizenship; to pass a Supreme Soviet decision on introducing a republican currency and to instruct the government to fulfill it in 1991 in order to protect the republican market; also, to carry out the land

reform on the principles of private property; to depoliticize the organs of law and order, of the army, the production sphere, and science and education; to adopt immediately a decision on the need for the legislature to remain in session constantly.

"Finally, I call on all political forces of Ukraine for unity and active counteraction against the offensive by great-power elements and reactionaries."

The rostrum was then given to Mykhaylo Holubets. On the Narodna Rada's behalf he read a draft statement of Ukraine's Supreme Soviet concerning the proposals submitted by the Union [Soyuz] deputy group to the USSR Supreme Soviet. Holubets said:

"In connection with the appeal of the Soyuz group that an extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies be convened as soon as possible and that a state of emergency be introduced on the whole territory of the Soviet Union, the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] declares: The situation prevailing today in the USSR is characterized by profound crisis manifestations. A painful process of going from totally centralized structures of power over to democracy is now under way. The sovereignties of republics are increasing and market mechanisms are being introduced. The Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine believes that the way out of the crisis is possible only along the path of further democratization of political life, the formation of a civilized society, assertion of the sovereignties of republics, and the resolution of social contradictions through constructive dialogue between diverse political forces.

"The calls for solving social problems through the introduction of a state of emergency are an attempt by the extremely conservative forces to turn the country back to the sadly notorious period of the administrative-suppressive system and remove the positive gains achieved in recent years.

The Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet is generally in control of the situation in the republic and is doing everything possible to get out of the crisis. Therefore, no grounds exist for introducing a state of emergency in the Ukraine. The Supreme Soviet of the ukraine views such calls as impermissible and they violate the sovereignity of the Ukrainian SSR.

"The Supreme Soviet of Ukraine addresses itself to the highest organs of state power of other republics and also to the Union's government organs with a call to display political realism and to distance itself from the aforementioned call of the Soyuz deputy group."

Following this statement, many deputies rushed to the microphones and started to insult each other. The spectacle continued until Deputy Volodymyr Yavorivskyy mounted the platform.

Yavorivskyy said: "I would advise to you do only one thing: Let us raise our sights. Let us raise our sights in order to see each other. There are no enemies among us today. In my view, we have nothing to divide us. Let us all say to ourselves: The Ukraine has reached the very edge of the abyss. Let us look to tomorrow when something irreparable may happen. Just look around and see what forces are rising one after another. Just think about this evil call of the Soyuz group. They are already cultivating new presidents, they are already proposing [words indistinct]. It is this development that must unite us. Those military segments are uniting and everything we are doing today may be wiped out tomorrow in the same way the center has rescinded our decision on R.4.5 billion for Chernobyl. The time has come for unity and national consensus in our ranks. Let us rise to this and prove that we are able to remove all barriers that kept us apart yesterday."

After this the deputies calmed down and decided to look into the draft statement once more.

Then Deputy Viktor Bed touched on the case of Stepan Khmara. Speaking on behalf of the Narodna Rada, he stated that the rearrest of Khmara on 12 April was groundless, resting solely on false accusations by General Nedryhaylo, deputy minister of the interior of the Ukraine. It was nothing but a fresh offensive by conservatives against democratic forces. It was decided to send Bed's statement to the republic's Supreme Court.

Later on, the session formed the legislative Commission for Defense and State Security. People's Deputy Vasyl Durdynets became its chairman.

Caucasus

Further Reportage on Georgian Earthquake Damage

Emergencies Commission Issues Report

LD3004125791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1227 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Apr (TASS)—According to preliminary data, six rayons suffered worst of all as a result of the earthquake in Georgia. Forty-nine people died and over 360 were injured. Seventeen thousand housing blocks were destroyed, as were over 80 percent of hospitals, schools, and preschool institutions for children. Communications were wrecked and roads destroyed, a TASS correspondent has been told at the USSR Cabinet of Ministers State Commission for Emergencies.

A republican commission for emergencies, operational groups of troops from the Caucasus Military District, and civil defense headquarters have been deployed and have started work.

Over 2,000 servicemen, medical workers, mountain rescuers, mountaineers and other specialists as well as groups belonging to the Association of USSR Rescue Groups are involved in search and rescue work.

Army field kitchens, tents, electricity generators and equipment have been delivered to the affected rayons. The population is being evacuated by helicopters and road transportation.

A team from the All-Union Emergency Medical Aid Center has flown out of Moscow to help the victims, taking with them a load of medicines and medical items.

The USSR government has appealed to the Georgian Government to inform it on what kind of aid should be given first and foremost. Steps are being taken to clarify the number of victims and the degree of damage caused by the earthquake.

Gorbachev Sends Condolences

LD3004160991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1534 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 30 Apr (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev has expressed profound condolences to the immediate families and close relatives of those who died and to the population of Georgia, which has been stricken by the earthquake. In a message promulgated here today, it is reported that the president has instructed the USSR Cabinet of Ministers to provide assistance in dealing with the aftermath of the catastrophe.

Georgia Rejects Moscow's Aid

AU3004162291 Paris AFP in English 1559 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Paris, April 30 (AFP)—The Soviet Republic of Georgia has called for assistance by the French Government to ease the plight of survivors of an earthquake that killed at least 100 people and injured 230 others, a statement issued by the Georgian mission here said Tuesday.

The appeal was made as Georgian authorities turned down an offer of assistance by the central government in Moscow, the statement added.

The mission urged the French people to "grant even small aid" to survivors of the quake that struck the Georgian Black Sea coast and the Caucasus region Monday.

Georgia which declared unilateral independence from the Soviet Union on April 9 has also asked for aid from international organisations.

South Ossetia Situation 'Very Tense'

LD3004125891 Moscow TASS in English 1229 GMT 30 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz April 30 TASS—A strong earthquake hit Dzhava District in South Ossetia at 12:13 Moscow time on Monday, damaging residential houses, public buildings, roads, bridges and electrical power lines.

According to seismologists, the quake measured 8.5 on the Richter scale at its epicenter between Tskhinvali and Kutaisi. Dozens of people were killed and heavily wounded. The Army continues searching for victims.

The miners' settlement of Kvaisa suffered serious damages. A multi-tonne mass of rock fell from mountains and blocked the Liakhva river near the settlement. The trapped water could break the dam and storm neighbouring villages at any moment.

No damage has been reported in Tskhinvali. Tremors were felt in South Ossetia again on Monday night and Tuesday morning.

The situation in the region is very tense. Georgian armed units shelled residential quarters near Tskhinvali on Monday night. Food and medicine shortages are sharply felt in the city. Trucks cannot reach Tskhinvali, as the Dzhava-Tskhinvali road has been destroyed and circuit roads are under Georgian control.

Situation 'Extremely Exacerbated'

LD3004155191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1457 GMT 30 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent V. Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz, 30 Apr (TASS)—As a result of the decision by the Georgian legislature to abolish two rayons, Tskhinvali and Znauri, and to join them to Gori and Kareli Rayons respectively, the situation in South Ossetia has become extremely exacerbated, it was reported to TASS at the press center of the extraordinary committee of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet.

There was an intensive exchange of fire for several hours between hostile sides in the village of Tsinagari in Leninogori Rayon. As a result of the armed clash, five Ossetians were killed and two people were seriously injured. Only the intervention of sub-units of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops prevented further bloodshed.

In Tskhinvali there is currently a catastrophic shortage of food products, medical supplies, and fuel. Vehicles carrying humanitarian aid cannot get through to the town because the Dzhava-Tskhinvali road is destroyed and all the circuitous roads are under the control of the Georgian side.

The situation has been extremely aggravated due to a new misfortune—the earthquake that has encompassed part of the oblast's territory. As already reported, Dzhava Rayon suffered particularly badly.

The stream of refugees into North Ossetia has intensified. More than 25,000 people have been registered in

Vladikavkaz. The problem of accommodating them and providing facilities for them in the republic is extremely exacerbated.

Speaking on local television, Sergey Khetagurov, chairman of the North Ossetian SSR Council of Ministers, appealed to people in rural areas of the republic to show mercy and humanity toward the refugees and victims of the earthquake and to provide them with temporary shelter in their homes.

TV Describes Tskhinvali Tensions

LD3004225891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2115 GMT 30 Apr 91

[From the "Television News Service" Program]

[Text] Unfortunately, life does not spare us even on holidays. There are earthquakes, strikes, and interethnic conflict.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent A. Parfenekov] Night in Tskhinvali is not safe. The town is still without electrical power. The darkness is very useful for some. The situation in the center of South Ossetia and its environs remains tense. Oil has been poured on the fire by the decision of the Georgian Supreme Soviet to abolish the Tskhinvali and Znauri Rayons.

So militia and internal troops patrols have to move around the town in combat vehicles. Harmless-looking small cars sometimes try to compete with them—and not just on the spur of the moment: they are often transporting weapons.

Our film crew took part in a night raid. [video shows view from a moving armored personnel carrier] It is a rather risky business, but quite normal for Tskhinvali today. There is a long way to go here before the situation is normalized. [video shows search of another vehicle]. The confrontation between the Georgian and Ossetian sides does not stop, even though sub-units of the Internal Troops are monitoring the situation. The armed patrols are helping the townsfolk.

Aleksandr Parfenekov for TSN. [end recording]

Interior Ministry Protests USSR Troop Actions

'Tyrannical Actions' Cited

AU3004123191 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 12 Apr 91 p 1

["Statement by the Office of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Internal Affairs"; date not given]

[Text] The Georgian people and members of all nationalities residing in Georgia are united in their desire for the restoration of Georgian statehood and the establishment of truly democratic, lawful forms of government. The results of the 31 March 1991 referendum were a clear confirmation of the will of the Georgian population. However, there are forces which are trying to resist this process and suppress the desire of the absolute majority of the Georgian population.

It was those forces which inspired the ethnic crisis in the former South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast. Bloodshed has been provoked and thousands of people forced to leave their homes in a land where Georgians and Ossetians had lived side by side in peace for centuries.

Immediately after the declaration of a state of emergency in the region, the Georgian Militia began to take energetic measures to ensure the safety of the population, taking action to halt the activities of armed bandits and confiscate weapons held by the population. The militia carried out this action jointly with the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] who, it has to be said frankly, did not always conscientiously perform the tasks called for by the state of emergency and the curfew, and were not always principled and objective. Moreover, there were occasions when they stood in armed confrontation with Georgian militia officers.

The tyrannical action by men of the Internal Troops has become particularly manifest of late. Without the consent of the leadership of the Republic of Georgia or our ministry, more and more contingents of the Internal Troops are being brought into Samachablo from various parts of the USSR and senior USSR MVD officials are arriving from Moscow who, behind the back of the republican MVD and without coordinating with it, are taking various measures, including measures which flout the honor and authority of the Georgian militia.

On 10 April 1991 Internal Troop subunits used armored personnel carriers and military helicopters to disarm 22 Georgian Militia officers on duty at their post in the village of Okoni in Kornisskiy Rayon. On the same day, in the village of Tamarasheni in Tskhinvalskiy Rayon, 48 submachine guns were taken away from Georgian Internal Affairs officers and 21 Militia officers were detained, while in the village of Eredvi the rayon procurator's office room was ransacked and the houses of three village inhabitants were unlawfully searched.

It should be noted that taking part in these interior troop operations were officers of Ossetian nationality who had been dismissed from the internal affairs bodies for various offenses.

In the early hours of 11 April, Internal Troops in eight armored personnel carriers literally went on a hunt for Georgian militia officers in order to disarm them.

On the morning of 11 April, 12 armored personnel carriers of the Internal Troops burst into the village of Dvani in Karelskiy Rayon. The troops ransacked militia posts and farming community buildings and set fire to the churches of St. George and the Holy Trinity.

All this took place while Colonel General Yu.V. Shatalin, commander of the USSR MVD Internal Troops was in

the city of Tsinkhvali. It is therefore not hard to guess what the real aims and objectives of the Internal Troops were. It is probably no accident, either, that these actions by the Internal Troops were carried out on 10 and 11 April—in other words, immediately after the emergency session of the republican Supreme Soviet adopted the Act on the Restoration of Georgian Statehood.

It is also noteworthy that the sending of an additional contingent of Internal Troops into Samachablo coincided with the referendum being held in the republic. The ideological grounds for sending them in were laid by the Union press and television which, with their one-sided and biased reports, deliberately distorted the situation in the region.

The Office of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Internal Affairs lodges a strong protest over the tyranny and violence perpetrated by the USSR MVD Internal Troops and demands an immediate end to such action. The USSR MVD leadership should issue an order to Gen. Yu.V. Shatalin to prevent unlawful acts against officers of the Republic of Georgia Procuracy and Militia which flout their rights and honor.

We categorically demand that Gen. Yu.V. Shatalin take the time to meet with the leadership of the Republic of Georgia and our ministry to look into matters of stabilizing the situation in the former South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast.

If these demands are not met, we will be forced to report the facts of tyrannical action by the Internal Troop units to the foreign media. At the same time, the internal affairs bodies will resort to acts of protest.

Office of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Internal Affairs.

SAKINFORM.

Minister's Letter to USSR Counterpart

AU0105093791 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 12 Apr 91 p 1

[Letter from D. Khabuliani, Republic of Georgia minister of internal affairs, to Boris Karlovich Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs; date not given]

[Text] At 0700 [0300 GMT] on 10 April 1991 in the village of Okona in Kornisskiy (formerly Znaurskiy) Rayon, five armored personnel carriers with their crews and other servicemen numbering up to 70 men armed with automatic weapons drove up to the militia post where 22 Georgian militiamen were on duty. They surrounded the post and, by threatening to open fire, forced all the militiamen at the post to line up and began to check their identification. Among the servicemen was Militia Captain L. Dzhioyev, former deputy chief of the Znaurskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department. Five helicopters flew to the scene, three of which landed. Persons in military uniform without any insignia got out of the helicopters and ordered the servicemen to take away the militiamen's weapons. They then locked the militiamen in a bus belonging to the militia post, got inside the official car of the chief of Znaurskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department, Yason Rachvelishvili, and stole his personal belongings from it. Personal belongings of the militiamen were also stolen. At approximately 0700 on the same day, Internal Troops arrived in the village of Eredvi in 10 armored personnel carriers without any reason. They searched the homes of three villagers of Georgian nationality without the permission of the procurator, breaking doors and household belongings. Similar acts were committed in the Eredvi village club, where the door of the rayon procurator's office was forced open, his desk and chairs were smashed and official documents stolen. Furniture and equipment in the club hallroom were damaged.

On the same day at 0500 [0100 GMT] Internal Troops arrived in five armored personnel carriers in the village of Tamarasheni. They unlawfully arrested 21 Georgian militiamen and took them to the city of Tskhinvali. In addition, 48 submachine guns were taken away from militiamen stationed there on the orders of the Republic of Georgia Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD].

All this took place while Shatalin, commander of the Internal Troops, was in Tskhinvali. From this it can be concluded what the mission of the Internal Troops was and what aims they were pursuing.

In connection with this, the Republic of Georgia MVD categorically states the following:

1. Instruct Shatalin to cease the tyrannical actions against members of the militia and the procuracy.

2. Actions in which people who have compromised themselves and who have been dismissed from what the internal affairs bodies take part in must be stopped.

3. We categorically insist that Shatalin take time to meet with the leadership of the republic and the republican MVD and discuss the situation.

4. If our demands are not met, we shall be forced to report the tyranny that has been perpetrated to the foreign media and resort at the same time to acts of protest.

[Signed] **D. KHABULIANI,**

Republic of Georgia Minister of Internal Affairs.

SAKINFORM.

Georgian Supreme Soviet Appeals for Unity

AU0105083391 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 12 Apr 91 p 1

[Appeal by Georgian Supreme Soviet "To All of Georgia"]

[Text] On 9 April 1991 the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet, executing the will of the Georgian people, proclaimed Georgia a sovereign state by an Act on the Restoration of State Independence.

The referendum held on 31 March 1991 showed clearly that the Georgian people were fully ready to take that step. How gratifying it is that at one of the most decisive phases of the centuries-old dramatic history of our state, the entire non-Georgian population of Georgia has come to stand side by side with the Georgian people. This has confirmed yet again the groundlessness of the myth widely propagated by the imperial powers during the period of Communist rule about the national intolerance of the Georgian people.

The legal proclamation of the restoration of statehood should be follwed by its actual restoration, which cannot be the consequence of one single Act. The level of political thought and the creative potential and unity of the state and its people are unilaterally determining the irreversibility and durability of this process. "A people struggling for freedom will acquire freedom." The Rubicon has been crossed, the calls to combine forces have lost their declaratory nature and have become a permanent attribute of the existence of free Georgia.

The Georgian Supreme Soviet expresses confidence that in this complex and tense, but at the same time fine and elevated period of our history, all of Georgia will stand staunchly shoulder to shoulder with its own elected Supreme Soviet and will yet again confirm the historic truth that in difficult times, Georgia has always been capable of channeling all its physical and mental energies into repulsing an enemy onslaught.

The Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet appeals to the whole population of Georgia to put aside for a while their own personal social and political interests and to make their daily activities subordinate to the interests of the state. The cause we have revived is worth it.

May God be our Protector.

Amen!

[Signed] REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA SUPREME SOVIET.

Armenia Creates State of Emergency Council

NC0105061791 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 30 Apr 91

["Report by Mavr Danielyan and Khrayr Chamchyan from the session of the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet"; radio headline—recorded]

[Text] [Unidentified correspondent] The second session of the first convocation of the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet continued its deliberations today.

The deputies observed a minute of silence in memory of those who died during the 29 April earthquake in the Georgian Republic. The presiding chairman, Gagik Arutyunyan, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, approved the message of condolence from the Armenian Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers to the Georgian Republic's leadership and people. The message confirms Armenia's readiness to help the earthquake-stricken republic. The chairman also noted that assistance has already begun.

Vazgen Manukyan, chairman of the Council of Ministers, briefed a closed session of the Supreme Soviet about the exceedingly tense situation in Armenia's border regions, Getashen, and Nagorno-Karabakh. The session then took a recess.

The parliament resumed work at 1700 in a closed session. It discussed the situation and adopted the following decision:

The decision of the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet on creating a Republican Temporary Council of State of Emergency [artakarg iravichaki hanrapetakan zhamanakavor khorhurd]:

In view of the emergency situation that has emerged in the border zones of the Armenian Republic and Azerbaijan, the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet decides:

1. To create a Republican Temporary Council of State of Emergency to be made up of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers Presidium.

2. To enlist the leaders of the public and political organizations represented in the legislature in the work of the council.

3. To empower the council to adopt decisions aimed at ensuring the security of the normal functioning of the republic. If necessary and at the request of one-third of the deputies, these decisions could be confirmed by the Supreme Soviet. The implementation of the decisions adopted by the council is obligatory over the entire territory of the republic.

4. The functions of the council will cease on 1 June 1991, unless the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet adopts a further decision.

The Supreme Soviet also adopted a declaration which was read out by Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet:

[Ter-Petrosyan] A war situation [paterazmakan vichak] has emerged in Nagorno-Karabakh, Shaumyanovskiy Rayon, Getashen subrayon, and along the border zone between Azerbaijan and Armenia. The Azerbaijani Communist regime, with the cooperation of the highest leadership of the USSR and with the direct participation of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry's Internal Troops, and violating universal human laws and international human rights, is continuing to apply its policy of forced deportation of the Armenian population from its historical homeland.

On 25 April the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet, concerned about the daily aggravating situation, demanded the convocation of an extraordinary session of the Congress of the USSR People's Deputies. In reply, the situation is being exacerbated at the instigation of and military assistance given by the center. Armenian settlements all along the Armenian-Azerbaijani border are being fired upon.

The Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet regards the USSR central authorities' policy to drag Armenia into a war as a policy of state terrorism directed against the Armenian people and its legitimate authorities and considers the operations put into effect as an aggression against the Armenian Republic. The Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet declares that complete responsibility for the exacerbation of the situation and its consequences will be borne by the USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Ministries of Defense and Internal Affairs, and the USSR Committee for State Security.

The Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet insists on the urgent convocation of an extraordinary session of the Congress of the USSR People's Deputies as a necessary condition to end the prevailing situation.

In the face of the alarming danger, the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet appeals to the peoples, legislatures, and governments around the world; to the Supreme Soviets of the Union republics; and to people of goodwill and calls on them to make all efforts to stop the aggressive operations directed against the Armenian people.

[Unidentified reporter] This declaration was adopted with 174 in favor, one against, and one abstention.

The Armenian Supreme Soviet will continue its deliberations next week.

Armenian-Azerbaijani Shootouts Continue

LD3004221491 Moscow TASS in English 2114 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 30 TASS—Shootouts break out on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan. At a closed meeting of the Armenian parliament session this morning, deputies discussed the ongoing provocations in areas bordering on Azerbaijan, reports from Yerevan say.

Azerbaijanians do not cease armed raids of villages in the Idzhevanskiy, Noyemberyanskiy, Gorisskiy, Vaiskiy, Yekhegnadzorskiy and Araratskiy districts in the past few days, a spokesman for the public relations department of the Armenian state security committee (KGB) told TASS. [sentence as received] Injured among the civilian population are reported.

On Monday and today, residents of Ashagy Askipara and Yukhary Askipara villages in Azerbaijan's Kazakh district and military posts located there came under intensive fire from militants in Armenia's Idzhevanskiy and Noyemberyanskiy districts, an AZERINFORM correspondent reports from Baku.

According to the Azerbaijan Interior Ministry and KGB, militants used hail control guns, flame-throwers and automatic weapons during the military action.

Servicemen from the Soviet Army and USSR Interior Ministry units together with the republican police and KGB returned the fire and forced the militants to cease the shooting. In repulsing the bandits' attack, three servicemen were injured.

New Clashes Between Armenians, Azerbaijanis

LD0105102991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1005 GMT 1 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert, 1 May (TASS)—There was another armed clash on Tuesday in Azerbaijani villages inhabited mainly by Armenians. This time blood was shed in the villages of Chaykend and Martunashen. Armenian fighters shelled troop units and these troops returned fire.

According to the Azerbaijan Ministry of Internal Affairs there are some dead and injured. The number of victims is being clarified.

Missiles Batter Azerbaijani Town Shusha

LD3004201391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Video report from Shusha by correspondent M. Mamedov—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Mamedov] The inhabitants of Shusha, one of Azerbaijan's most ancient towns, situated in Nagorno-Karabakh, were awoken by the explosions of missiles which rained down on them in the hours before dawn. Over 40 missiles were unleashed on the town. Dozens of houses were destroyed and people have been injured. The mosque of (Yukhary-Gokhara), a monument of Azerbaijani architecture, was also damaged. An extra contingent of Internal Troops has been brought into Shusha and military employees of the republican state security committee have started searching for bandit groups with the aid of helicopters. [video shows damaged buildings, armored vehicles moving into a square, helicopter flying overhead]

[Colonel V.M. Zhukov, commander of the emergency region in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] Clearly, these are the same missiles which are being used in the fight against these hail-guns, and their supplies have been kept somewhere, and they are being transported.

[Mamedov] Is it possible to say that the republic is quite simply in danger today?

[V.A. Guseynov, chairman of the Azerbaijani KGB] The situation is critical, one cannot predict which way events will turn, especially in the border areas. We are systematically keeping an eye on violations of airspace. They are still going on despite our appeals to the Center and the Defense Ministry and the KGB leadership for an end to these illegal flights which are being carried out by—let us be blunt—terrorists from Armenian territory who are carrying out, by our reckoning, from eight to 10 helicopter flights every day over Azerbaijani territory, including Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast.

Mutalibov Threatens Sanctions Over NKAO

LD3004130191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Apr 91

[Text] Our newsroom today received from the AZERINFORM news agency the text of a statement by Ayaz Niyaziyevich Mutalibov, president of the Republic of Azerbaijan, in connection with events in the region.

The president of the Republic of Azerbaijan demands the immediate cessation of interference by Armenia in sovereign Azerbaijan's internal affairs. For more than three years now, the statement says, the blood of innocent people in Nagorno-Karabakh has been shed and there has been no let-up in thefts, explosions, and killings. For more than three years the nationalist forces in Armenia, having unleashed interethnic conflict based on totally unfounded territorial claims on Azerbaijan in a conflict that they are stubbornly whipping up, have been causing grief, tears, and suffering.

The Supreme Soviet of Armenia, in spite of the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, has still not rescinded its anticonstitutional decisions on joining the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan Republic to Armenia. Spurning repeated appeals to end its interference in Azerbaijan's internal affairs, Armenia has for over three years now been carrying out large-scale acts of terrorism, verging on military aggression, on the territory of the republic.

The president emphasizes that fresh confirmation of aggressive intent is furnished by the Armenian Government's decision to provide armed protection for Armenian residents in Azerbaijan. Misleading public opinion with disinformation about the alleged danger of an attack by Azberbaijan and inflaming feelings of hatred among the Armenian people, the leadership in the neighboring republic has, for the purpose of holding on to its own power and feeding personal ambitions, set up its own armed forces.

We have delegated the defense of our sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the republic to the Government of the USSR, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Defense, and the USSR KGB, and are certain that they will fulfill their constitutional duty toward the people of Azerbaijan, the statement continues. At the same time, we are determined to defend our borders and put an end to the criminal actions of terrorists and armed gangs from Armenia with our own forces.

If our demands are not met, the republic's president stresses in conclusion, there will remain no other option for us, since we are guided by the interests of the security of the state, than to adopt economic and other sanctions against Armenia and to implement the above-mentioned demands.

Nagorno-Karabakh Situation 'Extremely Tense'

LD3004221991 Moscow TASS in English 2150 GMT 30 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow May 1 TASS—The situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region and adjacent Armenian-populated areas of Azerbaijan remains extremely tense, a TASS correspondent reported from Stepanakert, the administrative centre of Nagorno-Karabakh, on Tuesday.

No electricity is supplied to the former Shaumyan district which was earlier abolished by the Azerbaijani parliament. Civil aviation helicopter flights there have been forbidden. Industrial plants are at a standstill. Flour reserves are petering out, the correspondent reported.

Farmers work in the fields under the protection of USSR Interior Ministry servicemen because civilians are often fired upon. The area itself is also subjected to shelling. There are killed and wounded on both sides.

In an interview with a TASS correspondent who visited Shaumyanovsk, spokesmen for the Armenian population of the area described the current situation as an attempt to bring about deportation of Armenians from the area as well as from two Armenian villages of Khamlar where the situation is now critical.

On the night of April 29 to 30, two Armenian villages were fired upon from the direction of a number of villages of the Kazakh district of Azerbaijan, the ARMENPRESS news agency reported referring to the republican interior ministry.

Firing with brief intervals continued until four a.m. after which residents of one of the Armenian villages had to abandon outlying houses, the ARMENPRESS report said.

According to the data of the Azerbaijani Interior Ministry, measures to ensure the safety of the population and restore legality and order were taken on April 30 in the course of disarming unlawful armed groups and checking compliance with passport registration regulations in a number of areas of Azerbaijan, including Nagorno-Karabakh.

In particular, republican militia, USSR Interior Ministry troops and the army jammed armed groups' channels of

communication and interrupted their contact with their headquarters in Armenia, the AZERINFORM news agency reports.

Militants in Markunashen village put up a fierce resistance to the law and order maintenance forces, AZERINFORM reported.

Three mortars, 48 mortar shells, 15 home-made antitank mines, 84 units of firearms and blank weapons, thousands of rounds of ammunition, three radio stations, four motor vehicles and three armoured personnel carriers were seized from militants during the operation. Forty-five militants were apprehended. Three servicemen were slightly wounded.

In view of the aggravation of the situation on the border of the two republics, the Armenian parliament on Tuesday issued a statement accusing the Azerbaijani leadership and all-union authorities of pursuing a "policy of forcible deportation of the Armenian population from their age-old lands."

The Armenian parliament described actions being performed as an "aggression against the Republic of Armenia" and again demanded immediate convocation of an extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies as an indispensable vehicle to get out of the current situation.

The Armenian parliament formed a provisional republican emergency situation council consisting of all members of the presidia of the republican parliament and government.

Azerbaijan Approves Results of Moscow Meeting

LD3004194391 Moscow TASS in English 1925 GMT 30 Apr 91

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku April 30 TASS—At its session here today, the presidium of the Azerbaijan Parliament discussed the results of the meeting between the Soviet president and the leaders of nine union republics, including Azerbaijan, and the joint statement on pulling the country out of crisis, which was adopted at the meeting.

The presidium approved the results of the meeting and noted that it had demonstrated that the leaders of the country and the republics approach with a sense of responsibility the deepening crisis in the country and seek to overcome it as soon as possible.

The presidium adopted a statement saying that concerted actions are needed today as desperately as ever. The presidium fully supported the intentions to implement decisive measures to restore constitutional order and create conditions for scrupulous compliance with laws.

The people of Azerbaijan is especially interested in these measures also because they have seen encroachments on the republic's territorial integrity and sovereignty for the fourth year now and aggression staged by armed groups in Armenia, which were formed unlawfully.

The republic, which took part in the union referendum, is fully determined to achieve its sovereignty in a community of states where violence or its threat on the part of other entities of the federation is totally absent, the statement emphasises.

We express our solidarity with and support for the joint anti-crisis measures aimed at restoring the normal performance of the national economy. Each republic, each people and any region of the country suffers from the aggravation of the socio-economic situation.

The presidium of the Azerbaijan parliament joins the call by the leaders of the union and the republics for ending strikes under economic and political slogans. The struggle between various political trends and movements should proceed according to democratic and civilised principles.

Central Asia

Dzasokhov Presses Need for 'Political Stability'

PM2904145391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondents G. Dildyayev and T. Yesilbayev report: "Ensuring Stability"]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 18 Apr—As already reported, A.S. Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, is in the capital of Kazakhstan. Today he had a meeting with the ideological aktiv of Alma-Ata and Alma-Ata Oblast, representatives of the scientific and creative intelligentsia, heads of ministries and departments, people working in the mass media, and the apparatuses of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's president, and Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputies.

In his speech to those present, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said that a universal model of the transitional period is being steadily formed in Kazakhstan and implemented in several main areas. The first of these is political, whereby the republic's party organization ensures the most painless, natural implementation of the CPSU's slogan on close collaboration with soviets and economic bodies. It is a question of ensuring that the party remains a vanguard political force and helps the formation of soviets by exerting an appropriate influence on socioeconomic processes.

The second area is that of interethnic relations. Multiethnic Kazakhstan is making good use of the new possibilities to give the concept of "sovereignty" appropriate, meaningful forms. The third area is the economy. The

republic's progressive initiative is that it is accumulating international experience in economic development.

Dwelling on the situation in the country, A.S. Dzasokhov said, in particular: Discussions about what is more important—the economy or politics—are futile in our conditions. We have gotten carried away: We do not listen to each other. First we say that the economy should take precedence, then we demand political reform. However, the truth is that we need to ensure political stability in the country in order to resolve economic tasks.

N.A. Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh SSR and first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the meeting.

Uzbek Leader Hails Republics' Joint Statement

LD2904181191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1028 GMT 29 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Lev Levin]

[Text] Tashkent, 29 Apr (TASS)—"A real chance for stabilizing the situation in the country"—This is how Islam Karimov, president of Uzbekistan, appraised the joint statement of the nine Soviet Union republics.

Speaking at a session of this republic's Cabinet of Ministers today, he stressed that there can be no return to the old command-administrative system. The adoption by the republics of declarations on sovereignty and the expansion of their rights in the political, economic, and social spheres are opening up good prospects for the transition to qualitatively new relations with the center.

Only the conclusion of the new union treaty can remove the acuteness of the tension in the country. As far as the statement signed by the nine leaders is concerned, it requires precise and responsible fulfillment in all its points, said the president of Uzbekistan.

Nishanov Meets With Voters in Fergana

PM0105085791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Meeting With Voters"]

[Text] R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, visited Fergana Oblast 27-30 April. He visited Bagdadskiy, Bulaytinskiy, Leningradskiy, Rashtanskiy, and Sokhskiy Rayons and a number of kolkhozes [collective farms], sovkhozes [state farms], enterprises, and institutions.

During the meetings with voters—rural and industrial workers and representatives of veterans, youth, trade union, and women's organizations—R.N. Nishanov talked about the USSR Cabinet of Ministers anticrisis program, the results of the all-Union referendum, and progress in work on the draft new Union treaty.

Questions about the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, primarily to do with legislation, the activity of the Soviet of Nationalities, and the measures that it is adopting to overcome the interethnic conflicts occurring in some parts of the country occupied a special place.

R.N. Nishanov reported on his activity as a deputy and work in fulfilling voters' instructions. This report received the universal support and approval of voters. At the same time, participants in the meeting voiced a number of criticisms of Union legislative, executive, and law enforcement organs and drew attention to the need to increase the effectiveness of the laws that are being adopted. In turn voters and farm directors talked about their work, the successful completion of the spring field work in agriculture, and the fulfillment of plans in the first quarter of this year.

At meetings voters put forward new instructions regarding socioeconomic questions and many views on the immediate adoption of concrete measures to strengthen labor and state discipline at all levels and increase the interest of the country's leadership in this work.

Turkmen President Appoints New Party Secretary

LD2804190191 Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Turkmen 1600 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Decree of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic president]

[Text] Comrade Matkarim Razhapov is relieved of his duty as chairman of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] State Planning Committee in connection with his election to the post of secretary of the Turkmenistan Communist Party Central Committee.

[Signed] Niyazov, president of the Turkmen SSR, City of Ashkhabad, 26 April 1991.

Turkmenistan's Muradov on Joint Statement

LD2904201191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Apr 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Soviet and foreign mass media continues to comment on the joint statement of the 10 on stabilizing the situation and overcoming the crisis. [passage omitted]

As you have probably noticed already, republican leaders have been putting forward their opinions on this in the "Vremya" program. Today Sakhat Muradov, chairman of the Turkmen Supreme Soviet, expressed his point of view.

[Begin recording] [Muradov] If we do not hurry with the adoption of the Union treaty, it will be a very serious obstacle to the preservation of the Union. We must make use of the joint statement, and everyone upon whom

future work on the Union treaty depends must finalize this project immediately and submit it for signing. It is a very difficult at present to get out of the crisis alone, without the Union. Those six republics which are currently refusing to sign the Union treaty will feel this very soon when the mechanism of the favored relationship, so to speak, will start acting to the benefit of those who sign the Union treaty.

[Correspondent Babayev] Are you not afraid that in the new Union the republics will be totally dependent of the center, as before?

[Muradov] If the Union treaty is signed the way it is presented in the draft then these fears are groundless. According to this treaty, it is not the Union which grants us the right, but we who grant the right to the Union. We accord to the Union those functions which are needed for resolving matters at the all-Union level. [end recording]

'Market Riots' Reported in Southern Tajikistan

PM2904151191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Apr 91 p 1

[Ya. Bessarab report: "Prices Hit Hard, But They Are Not Coming Down"]

[Text] A wave of market riots has swept across Kurgan-Tyube Oblast—Tajikistan's most southerly oblast. Enraged customers are ripping open sacks in the markets and tipping out their contents. The reason is quite clear—prices have almost tripled. In a matter of days the price of a kilogram of onions has gone up to 5 rubles (R) and that of potatoes and carrots to R3. Apples cost R5-6 and pears R8 per kilogram. While three small cucumbers grown under glass will cost you R3.

These prices may seem fair to the inhabitants of the northern regions of Russia, but in the south, where there are 2-3 crops a year!...

April 2 did not bring the expected abundance of goods on the store counters, which, apart from dusty bottles of juice, were completely empty, yet people still continue to get their wages, like everywhere else. And the clashes in the markets are scarcely going to stop until the state trade network provides an alternative to the market.

In previous years attempts were made to freeze prices by special resolutions passed by the local authorities. Now, however, the directors of the markets have instructions not to interfere.

Kyrgyz President Comments on Joint Statement

PM3004093391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 91 p 1

[Interview with President Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan by K. Bayalinov; date, place not given: "Union of Nine. Kyrgyzstan President Askar Akayev Comments on Republic Leaders' Joint Statement"]

[Text] [Bayalinov] How did the idea of signing the joint statement arise?

[Akayev] This happened at the meeting of the Union republics' leaders. First there was a discussion of the Union treaty, when the positions of Gorbachev and Yeltsin were reconciled. Then the idea of signing a joint statement arose. The text was drawn up there and then and was signed by nine people representing the union republics and by the USSR president.

[Bayalinov] Why was the statement signed for the Ukraine and Belorussia by people of less than top rank?

[Akayev] There was no political intent here: At that time Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Kravchuk was in Germany, and the Belorussian leader had fallen ill.

[Bayalinov] Does the fact that the statement was signed not signify a new attempt by M. Gorbachev to insure himself against unforeseen circumstances which might arise at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum and will arise, perhaps, at the upcoming Congress of People's Deputies?

[Akayev] Of course. And we helped him in this.

[Bayalinov] Will there now be nine Union republics in the USSR?

[Akayev] This is evidently so. The leaders of these republics declared their readiness to examine the draft Union treaty in their parliaments and then to sign it. And there is another special feature: The leaders of the nine republics reached an understanding that the interests of autonomous entities—even those which have declared that henceforth they are Union republics—will be represented precisely by the Union states to which the autonomous entities belong territorially. Otherwise there will be total confusion. In short, only the Union republics listed in the constitution will belong to the Union with rights as Union states. At the same time it was stated that the way to join the Union is also open to the other six republics.

[Bayalinov] What is implied by "most-favored regime for the republics which signed the Union treaty"?

[Akayev] This means that the other republics will obtain raw materials, commodities, etc. at world prices.

[Bayalinov] In dollars?

[Akayev] Maybe in dollars, too.

[Bayalinov] How do you see the USSR's prospects?

[Akayev] President Gorbachev recognized the republics' sovereignty, and somehow the very word "republic" gradually dropped out of the political lexicon. The term "state" is used now, with all the ensuing attributes of independence. The future Union will be none other than a union of sovereign states.